GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR THE PURPOSE OF

CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING:

Georgetown University and U.S. | Case No. 02-31 National Park Service-

Text Amendment

-----+

Monday, May 19, 2003

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The public hearing of Case No. 02-31 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

#### ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice Chairperson JAMES HANNAHAM Commissioner PETER MAY Commissioner

## **COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:**

ALBERTO BASTIDA Secretary

SHARON SANCHEZ Office of Zoning

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

## **APPEARANCES:**

# On Behalf of the Applicants:

CYNTHIA A. GIORDANO, ESQ.

of: Arnold & Porter

555 12th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

(202) 942-5000

FAX: (202) 942-5999

## I-N-D-E-X

ITEM	PAGE
Case 02-31:	
Preliminary Matters	10
Presentation of applicant's case	11
Statements of witnesses:	12
Nathan W. Gross	12
Report by the Office of Planning	17
Parties and persons in opposition	22
Larry Schuette	22
Gerardine Albers	32
Case 02-30:	
Preliminary Matters	36
Presentation of applicant's case	38
Statements of witnesses:	39
Alan Brangman	39
Sally Blumenthal	43
Tony Johnson	48
Stephen Muse	61
William Kirwan	66
Nathan W. Gross	73

### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(6:39 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Monday, May 19, 2003.

My name is Carol Mitten. And joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Peter May and James Hannaham. John Parsons has recused himself from these proceedings.

We have two cases before us this evening,
Zoning Commission Case Number 02-30 and 02-31. Before
I call each case, I want to give just a brief
explanation of why we have two cases this evening,
which will hopefully eliminate some confusion.

In general, we are here because Georgetown University wants to build a boathouse on land that is currently unzoned. We are considering two map amendment proposals that have been put forward.

One proposal, for W-1 zoning, also includes a text amendment to permit the boathouse use under the prevailing circumstances, in this case a site that lacks frontage, would have no on-site parking and so on. And that would be as a matter of right. The text amendment is generic and would apply

to all W-1 zone sites. It is not specific to the Georgetown site.

The second map amendment proposal is for W-0 zoning. W-0 is a new proposed zone, which is a lower density zone than any of the other waterfront zones, including W-1. The W-0 zone will permit boathouse use by special exception. And that's as distinct from matter of right under W-1, which allows greater control over potential adverse impacts.

In the first case this evening, the first case, we will hear testimony only regarding the text amendment to the W-1 zone regrading boathouses. As I said, this text amendment is generic and would apply to any property zoned W-1. It will not alone allow the boathouse project to proceed. So the first case is a text amendment.

In the second case, we will hear testimony as to which zone of the two that have been requested, W-O or W-1, we should map on the proposed Georgetown boathouse site. In that context, we will also consider the special exception and variance requests specific to the proposed Georgetown boathouse structure.

In order to promote efficiency of these hearings, those who have concerns that are specific to

2.0

the proposed Georgetown boathouse, I ask that you testify in the second case only. The first case is a generic text amendment.

If you testify in the first case and do not limit your testimony to the W-1 text amendment, I will interrupt you and ask you to confine your testimony to the text or hold your comments for the second hearing.

I would like to address a few other issues before we begin. And those are issues that are not before us this evening. First, the Zoning Commission has no control over the land swap between the National Park Service and Georgetown University. We will not hear testimony regarding the propriety of the land swap because it is outside our jurisdiction.

Second, we are here to consider two possible zoning categories for the subject property. We have received numerous letters asking us not to zone the property and to maintain the undeveloped state of the site.

law, when land is to be used for private purposes, whether or not it is federally or user is entitled to owned, the owner zonina. the property unzoned legally Keeping is not option for the Zoning Commission. appropriate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Testimony that asks us to keep the property unzoned will not be productive for you or informative for the Commission.

In spite of the things that I just mentioned that we don't want to hear about tonight, we very much want to hear your testimony about those areas that are within our jurisdiction. For those of you who are here about the proposed Georgetown boathouse, we would like to hear from you both as to which zoning category you think is appropriate for the site as well as potential adverse impacts related to size, height, proximity to the Capital Crescent Trail, orientation to the river, and so on.

One last comment before we formally begin.

Each hearing tonight is somewhat different because the rules of procedure are different. So in the first case, the text case, there are no parties who will not be sworn in. In the second case, which is the case specific to the proposed boathouse, we will consider the request that we have for party status, and all witnesses will be sworn.

Parties will be given an opportunity for cross-examination. In the event that the property is ultimately zoned W-O, the university will have the burden of proof to show that the proposed use will not

2.0

tend to adversely impact adjacent properties, including the waterfront.

So, with that, what I hope is a clarification, I will now call the first case, which is the text amendment case, which I suspect most of you are not here for. And that is case number 02-31. This is a request by Georgetown University and the National Park Service for text amendments to sections 199.1, 901.1, 2101.1, and 3202.3 of 11 DCMR. And those are the zoning regulations.

The notice of this hearing was published in the D.C. Register on March 21, 2003. And this hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 30-21, which are the procedures for rulemaking hearings.

Copies of the hearing announcement are available to you near the door, on the rack by the door. The order of procedure for the first case, which I know will move smoothly and quickly so we can get to the reason why you are all here, will be as follows. We will take up preliminary matters followed by a brief presentation by the petitioner, the presentation by the Office of Planning, reports of any other government agencies, report of the affected ANC, — in this case, all ANCs are affected because it is a

1 generic text amendment -- organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition. 2 following time constraints will be 3 in 4 maintained this hearing and next. 5 Organizations will have five minutes. Individuals will have three minutes. 6 7 We will maintain these time limits as 8 strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a 9 reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves 10 the right to change the time limits for presentations, 11 if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded. 12 All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. 13 cards are located on the table near the door. 14 When 15 you come forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter, who is sitting to our 16 17 right. 18 The decision of the Commission in this 19 case and the next must be based on the public record. 20 avoid any appearance to the contrary, 21 Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during a 22 23 recess or at any other time.

Mr. Bastida and Ms. Sanchez will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural

24

1	questions. Please turn off all beepers and cell
2	phones at this time so as not to disrupt these
3	proceedings.
4	Mr. Bastida, do we have any preliminary
5	matters in the first case?
6	PRELIMINARY MATTERS
7	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, Madam Chairman.
8	The petitioner has complied with the posting
9	requirements and the maintenance of the postings. And
10	the staff believes that the Commission can proceed
11	with the hearing.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now, this is the text
13	amendment. So we don't have a posting for the text
14	amendment, right?
15	SECRETARY BASTIDA: You're correct. I'm
16	sorry.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just want to make
18	sure we're all on the same page.
19	SECRETARY BASTIDA: I just, then, should
20	say that the staff mailed a notice of proposed hearing
21	to all of the ANCs.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
23	SECRETARY BASTIDA: And thank you for the
24	correction.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. All

1	right. I think we are ready to proceed as quickly as
2	we can through the first text amendment.
3	MS. GIORDANO: Thank you, Madam Chair,
4	members of the Commission.
5	PRESENTATION OF APPLICANT'S CASE
6	MS. GIORDANO: Cynthia Giordano from
7	Arnold and Porter law firm representing the
8	petitioner. With me this evening is Nathan Gross.
9	What we would like to do, we just have one
10	witness. Mr. Gross is very quickly going to present
11	the text amendment proposal. First, we thought that
12	we would just do very quickly a chronology.
13	I think your explanation, Madam
14	Chairperson, of the interplay between these cases was
15	very helpful, but just to kind of review sort of the
16	sequence of the applications and how they relate very
17	quickly, I'll ask Mr. Gross to do that. Then he will
18	summarize the text amendments and compare the text
19	amendment before you with the W-O text.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
22	MR. GROSS: Thank you. Good evening,
23	Madam Chair, members.
24	STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES
25	MR. GROSS: The first sequence is complete

with dates, a little bit more of an elaboration on yours. We filed on behalf of the applicant on August 6, 2002. At the time of set-down, the Zoning Commission decided to advertise in the alternative with our W-1 map and text proposal and then also to consider the W-0 zone that the Office of Planning had prepared for consideration by the Zoning Commission. We then went ahead and filed prehearing submissions on our original application.

The Zoning Commission then held its public hearing on the W-O zone in furtherance of the Anacostia waterfront initiative and other water-oriented uses around the city on January 23rd.

Under the W-O zone as proposed, it is possible for a property that is unzoned to apply for W-O zoning and a special exception for one of the special exception uses as one application. And that is the nature of our second case this evening in the alternative with the original W-1.

April 24th, the Zoning Commission took preliminary action on the W-O text amendment. And so tonight's hearing in both parts will have both the W-I zoning and the W-O zoning and the text amendments. The text amendments all are part of the waterfront series, which currently includes W-I, W-2, and W-3 and

if finally adopted will include the W-O zone as well.

if original So our proposed text amendments fit in the same general place in the zoning regulations as the W-O amendment -- and, actually, the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission incorporated our original four amendments with some modifications. And that is what I would like to spend the next five or seven minutes on. And we prepared this chart to do that hopefully in a simple way.

The first amendment, in boldfaced type, is as advertised in case 02-31 and also as we filed it. It is simply a definition for a non-motorized boathouse with eligible watercraft indicated and some indication of what the boathouse may include by way of facilities.

Now, they're underlined. There are differences with the W-O definition. Before discussing that, I need to jump down to number two, amend the use provisions of the proposed W-1 zone.

initial petition The in this case requested matter-of-right use in the W-1 zone, which already existed, of course, with certain matter-of-right provisos. The first of those was that it would be limited to use by a boat club, private institution, public school, other local government

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

entity for recreational or competitive boating activities of a noncommercial and nonprofit nature.

I jumped to that because in the W-0 package of amendments, the eligible watercraft were taken out of the definition and put into a separate definition of non-motorized watercraft. However, on the other hand, the limitation on the eligible users, instead of being in the use provisions, was actually put into the W-0 version of the definition. However, the substance, whether it's in the definitions or partly in the regs, is very nearly identical.

Now, under the use provisions at the top of the second page of the chart, boathouse is a special exception use in the W-O zone. And in the W-O package, it continues to be a matter-of-right use in the W-I zone.

Going to amendment number 3, which is the parking schedule, the petition of the applicant was that the existing requirement for boat club or marina but changed to boathouse and marina could either be one for each four berths or slips but with a new provision that states, "provided that no parking shall be required for a boathouse on a property that lacks street access."

Now, the Anacostia waterfront initiative

2.0

in the W-O zone also contemplates usage in some locations along the rivers, where there may not be street access. And so the W-O has a special exception that allows a waiver of all parking provided certain criteria are met. So either approach can get to no parking but with a slightly different mechanism.

Fourth, there is a problem under the existing zoning regulations in section 3202.3 of obtaining a permit on a lot that is not a lot of record.

What I have included here in the boldfaced type is the modified amendment that the Zoning Commission and Office of Planning and Office Corporation Counsel have worked out a different wording than what we originally submitted. Wе included that text because we think it is clearer than what we originally submitted. And we would be happy to go with that text.

In the W-O package, it only refers to the W-O zone. We included W-I just in case the ultimate result is W-I zoning, rather than W-O, but the applicant is mainly interested in timing in that regard, whether it's W-I or W-O. We recommend adoption of the package of amendments, whether in exactly the W-O format or the original format as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	submitted.
2	That concludes my testimony. We will be
3	happy to answer any questions.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Any questions
5	from Mr. Gross? This is about the W-1 generic text
6	amendment. Any questions?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank
9	you. We will move to the report by the Office of
10	Planning.
11	MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair,
12	members of the Commission.
13	REPORT BY THE OFFICE OF PLANNING
14	MR. LAWSON: My name is Joel Lawson. I am
15	with the District of Columbia Office of Planning.
16	The Zoning Commission case number 02-31,
17	the National Park Service and Georgetown University
18	have requested W-1 zoning regulation text amendments
19	to facilitate the construction of private boathouses
20	on the waterfront.
21	The W-1 proposed text amendments would
22	define the term "boathouse" at "boathouse is a
23	permitted use in the W-1 zone" and make additional
24	text amendments, which would, in essence, eliminate
25	street frontage and parking requirements for

boathouses.

2.0

The text amendments were intended to expedite consideration of a proposal to develop a Georgetown University boathouse on a currently unzoned and undeveloped federal parcel of the Potomac River waterfront. And that's Zoning Commission case number 02-30.

The Office of Planning had originally suggested alternative, more comprehensive wording for W-1 text amendments in the event that the then proposed W-0 zone was not proceeded with. In the interim, the Zoning Commission has taken proposed action on the W-0 zone.

The W-0 zone is considered by the Office of Planning to be a preferable zone for boathouses from a land use decision basis in that it provides for the use and would establish regulations and review mechanisms better suited to the use than W-1.

OP anticipates that W-0 zoning would be the recommended designation for future boathouse applications. Some of the W-1 changes advocated by the applicant have been incorporated into the W-0 zone. The W-0 amendment also clarified the definitions for boathouses, marinas, and yacht clubs in the W-1, 2, and 3 zones but did not otherwise amend

1	permitted uses or other regulations.
2	OP has some concerns with making the
3	applicant-proposed changes to the W-1 zone, which
4	allows a more intense form of development and is not
5	recommending changes to the W-1 zone at this time.
6	The Zoning Commission may at some point
7	wish to consider more comprehensive changes to the
8	W-1, 2, and 3 zones to bring regulations for future
9	boathouses as well as marinas and yacht club
10	applications in line with those of W-O if appropriate.
11	That concludes my speech. And we are
12	available for questions. Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
14	Lawson.
15	Any questions for Mr. Lawson? Any
16	questions?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair,
18	actually, I had a question earlier, but I don't want
19	to be the first violator of your instructions.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You are allowed to
21	ask questions.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, but I don't
23	want to be the first violator. I don't want to go to
24	the second case.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, I see.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask
2	you this, Mr. Lawson. I'm looking here at the
3	proposed definition of boathouse. I believe when it
4	mentions here that it says, "No rental or watercraft
5	to the general public shall be allowed," is that also
6	included for the W-1 in the definition 901.1? It's
7	actually on page 2 of what was advertised, number 3.
8	MR. LAWSON: The definition that was
9	proposed for boathouse was proposed to be the same for
10	W-0 as well as for W-1, 2, and 3.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So that's just a
12	definition pointblank for
13	MR. LAWSON: The definition would be the
14	same for all zoning.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I can tell you my
16	concern is at some point in time coming back to the
17	Zoning Commission and, all of a sudden, now we're
18	trying to do something for the public. I just see
19	this as not the public.
20	Now, I may be going off in left field,
21	Madam Chair, but I have a problem with just that
22	language that says, "No rental or watercraft to the
23	general public." It's like it's being just for a
24	specific group.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

I think perhaps when

we revisit the W-O text amendment to take final action, I think we will find that merely applies to the definition of the boathouse. But there are numerous other kinds of facilities.

I just don't remember all of them at the

I just don't remember all of them at the moment, but there's an accommodation in the list of uses that are permitted in W-O and the other waterfront zones that would under certain circumstances permit that kind of --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think it would have helped us if we would have had W-O, maybe if we had had that in front of us, because we just dealt with that. I think that would have helped us.

I don't know if staff can put their hands on it. My colleague has a copy of it. He's prepared. I think that would have been advantageous to help us.

I won't go back to that, but I did want to raise that concern because I'm thinking in advance. I'm hoping that if the Department of Recreation wants to use that and those kinds of things -- I don't want it just to be limited, and I want to make sure that we leave it open for the citizens to be able to go down there and be able to take full advantage of what's going on if it goes on. That's just my concern.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

2.0

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
2	Anyone else, questions for Mr. Lawson?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. I don't
5	know that we have any reports of other government
6	agencies on this text amendment case. Are there any
7	ANCs here to testify about the text amendment only,
8	the generic text amendment?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone who
11	would like to testify in support?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And this, again, is
14	just the text amendment. Anyone who would like to
15	testify in opposition of just the generic text
16	amendment? All right. Would you turn in your cards
17	for me? Thank you. Are you representing an
18	organization?
19	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes. I represent the
20	Washington Canoe Club.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Washington Canoe
22	Club?
23	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes, ma'am.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So you'll have
25	five minutes. And this is on the text amendment only,

1 nothing about the Georgetown boathouse. Okay. DR. SCHUETTE: I have to --2 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And your name? 4 PARTIES AND PERSONS IN OPPOSITION 5 DR. SCHUETTE: My name is Larry Schuette. I am the president of the Washington Canoe Club. 6 Ι 7 was absolutely confused, being completely naive, in 8 trying to read 2-31 and 2-30 and seeing 2-31 as the 9 second case and seeing 2-30 listed on the Web site as 10 the first case of the evening. I just couldn't 11 understand how you could do 2-30 without having done 12 2-31 first. And then you answered it by doing it 13 first. 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I'm glad that 15 that helped. DR. SCHUETTE: But I was like, how is this 16 possible? And what I was wondering is now that we are 17 18 talking abut this, the proposed changes the 19 regulations, do those amendments have to be in effect 2.0 for some period of time for public comment before we 21 can act on them? 22 Is this like coming out with a whole new 23 regulation or if you amend regulations, we come up with a new definition of a boathouse. Are we going to 24 25 immediately apply that in 02-30?

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Usually Ι don't answer questions from folks. 2 3 DR. SCHUETTE: Okay. Then I I'm sorry. 4 will keep going. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But I am willing to do it just to add clarity to what we're here for. 6 7 procedures require that we take proposed action on 8 anything that we do as long as we're using Zoning 9 Commission rules. 10 So if we have a text amendment, we take 11 proposed action, it's advertised for a minimum of 30 12 days, the National Capital Planning Commission gets to 13 determine whether there is any federal impact and make recommendations related to that. And then we take 14 final action. 15 We can be doing multiple things moving 16 things along, but we do have to take final action on a 17 18 text amendment before it can actually go into it. 19 DR. SCHUETTE: Got it. Washington Canoe 2.0 Club is very concerned about 02-31 and what we'll allow in boathouses as a matter of right. 21 It doesn't 22 seem to us that a rowing tank is a dependent use of 23 the river and, as such, should not be placed in the 24 floodplain of the Potomac River. Additionally, an 25 exercise area for ergometer use --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And this has to do with the generic text amendment now?

DR. SCHUETTE: This is absolutely straight in the definition of a boathouse. If you'll indulge me because I'm not that good at it? Let's see. Adopt a new definition in 191. This is a boathouse, a building or structure designed. It's on the first page, bullet number 1.

Again, additionally, an exercise area -- and I have ten copies of this because I was asked to provide that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

DR. SCHUETTE: And would not seem to be a dependent use of the river. In fact, the rowing tank or ergometer areas are used to be used when the river is unavailable due to ice and bad weather. Accordingly, they're anti-dependent or orthogonal uses of a boathouse and should be stricken from the boathouse definition.

I am very concerned that the W-O zone in this definition as written will continue to encourage these types of monster structures. As the committee of 100 stated in the review process for the W-O zone, the 40-foot height permitted the same as in the W-1, when combined with an 18 and a half-foot penthouse

2.0

1	allowance and more for architectural embellishments
2	and other purposes raises concerns for waterfront
3	sites and their exceptional visibility. We realize
4	these are standard provisions of the zoning code, but
5	we question whether they should be imposed in a
6	waterfront open space. The visual impact of such roof
7	structures in a commercial building row is very
8	different than the impact along the water's edge.
9	Either a special zone should be created
10	upstream of Key Bridge or a more restrictive approach
11	to the W-0 zone should be taken, namely special
12	exception places right.
13	In other words, we're putting in large
14	exercise areas. We're putting in these rowing tanks,
15	which can have a very bad impact on the Potomac River.
16	And they're not needed there. We're putting them in
17	a floodplain. And this is crazy. I would ask
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So you're saying that
19	they
20	DR. SCHUETTE: that they be stricken
21	from the definition.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: should be removed?
23	Okay.
24	DR. SCHUETTE: Absolutely removed from
25	that definition And you'll save the Potomac River.

The buildings won't have to be as large. 1 The second thing that we're here for, 02-30, is an exceedingly 2 3 large structure. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're not going to 5 talk about that right now. DR. SCHUETTE: I know. We're not going to 6 7 talk about it, but what we're going to talk about is 8 what's put in it as a matter of right and, in fact, 9 should be stricken from that. 10 It took me a long time. And I hate to 11 admit it because my Ph.D. is not from а great 12 university, but I am an engineer by training. like to think I can read this stuff. And you guys 13 14 have got me blown away. 15 I finally realized that this is something 16 that we're not against boathouses, but I think that 17 there should be a proper use of the structures in the 18 floodplain. 19 And what that really is about is putting 2.0 boats on the water, not ancillary stuff. And the 21 is rowing biggest in there tanks. That's one 22 chlorinated water right down in a floodplain. 23 we're not talking about the 100-year floodplain. 24 We're talking about the five-year floodplain.

And I'll reserve none of my time.

25

Thank

1 you.

2.0

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schuette. Let me just see if anyone has any questions for you.

Any question? Mr. Hannaham?

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: On the rowing tank, could you elaborate a bit on that? I'm not really quite sure what its function is.

DR. SCHUETTE: A rowing tank is used when the weather is inclement, such as the river being frozen or the wind being such or the water temperature being such that you can't row. And so it's basically a pool.

And so what they're talking about doing is putting a pool in an area of the river that floods on a very regular basis. We're not talking about 100-year floods. We're talking about ten five-year floods. And we're talking about putting a tank on the water, which is not dependent on the water.

I mean, boathouses are supposed to be things that are dependent on the use of the river. That's what goes in the boathouse, things that you need the river for.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: What are the approximate dimensions of a tank?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	DR. SCHUETTE: I can't speak
2	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Longer than a
3	rowboat?
4	DR. SCHUETTE: As big as this room.
5	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.
6	DR. SCHUETTE: As big as one can possibly
7	fit. There is no restriction in the definition to the
8	size of a rowing tank. In this case, Georgetown
9	University and I am not going to speak for the
10	university because that would be in 2-30, but it's an
11	extremely large rowing tank.
12	It, frankly, doesn't belong in the
13	floodplain, but they're putting it there because the
14	proposal for a boathouse, the definition of a
	boathouse, allows it. I think that should be stricken
15	
15 16	from what is allowed in the floodplain.
16	from what is allowed in the floodplain.  COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.
16 17	
16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.
16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with
	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with gasoline.
16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with gasoline.  COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. I thank you
16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with gasoline.  COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. I thank you very much. That's clear.
16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with gasoline.  COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. I thank you very much. That's clear.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.  DR. SCHUETTE: You're playing with gasoline.  COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. I thank you very much. That's clear.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else, questions for Mr. Schuette? Mr. May?

whatever you call it that is actually used in the rowing tank, is that a piece of equipment that is normally -- is it something that you have to row in the same one every time or that typically teams do. And, therefore, because the boat's there at the boathouse, they want to have the tank there so that they can always use the same boat.

DR. SCHUETTE: Rowing shells, like other watercraft, can be very personal. Rowing shells, however, can be configured so that one approximates the pole, the blades you would be using would be different. I mean, what we are talking about is a seat that slides on a rail with two places you tie your feet into. You hold onto an oar, and you row essentially on a board that is across a pool.

And so one could go to a pool. And one could do this in a pool if one figured the size of the pools correctly. That seat might be your slide. You might take that slide with you. But that slide is something that is portable. It certainly doesn't have to sit down by the waterfront.

At Georgetown University, as somebody in 2-30 proposes to do something like this, it might be an excellent question for them. I would be very surprised if they're going to have 25 or 30 seats and

2.0

1 there's only 25 or 30 students that are ever going to use those seats. There's going to be many apparently. 2 3 As far as I can tell, they're going to 4 have 1,000 rowers using that facility. One-sixth of 5 the school population is going to be using that facility rowing for as large as it is, as near as I 6 7 can tell. 8 If you can hold 100 eights and each 8 holds 8 people, -- even at Catholic U., I know this 9 10 math -- that's 800 people simultaneously. 11 can't figure it out. That can easily be done on 12 campus. 13 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not an engineer. 14 got most of what you were saying with that 100 eights 15 and slides and things like that, but I will be sure to 16 ask the question in the next case. Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. -- oh, 18 Mr. Hood? 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Before you leave, 2.0 you gave us an explanation. You extracted a few 21 things out of this definition. Madam Chair, if I am 22 in order, I would just like to have what you think 23 this definition should look like from my personal view, boathouse, what your definition of a boathouse 24 25 is in this context of what you have here in 199, the

1	new definition.
2	DR. SCHUETTE: I try to
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you could
4	submit it? I hate to give you homework.
5	DR. SCHUETTE: I would be very happy to
6	submit it after the fact.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That would help
8	me.
9	DR. SCHUETTE: I would be very happy to
10	submit my recommendations, which I did for 2-31. And
11	I apologize. I didn't know who to hand them to.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, if
13	you already have it, then I'll just use.
14	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Bastida will take
17	the submissions there.
18	All right. Anyone else testifying in
19	opposition on the text amendment?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Then we
22	are ready to close this case oh, I'm sorry. I'm
23	sorry. Come on forward.
24	MS. ALBERS: My name is Gerry Albers. I
25	am a D.C. resident.

1	I would also like to speak to the rowing
2	tank and just emphasize what Dr. Schuette just
3	presented to you, the concerns of what chemicals will
4	be used for the rowing tank. I would assume they
5	would need chlorine. It's like a swimming pool.
6	There would be storage of chlorine in a floodplain.
7	Also, national security issues. The blue
8	plains treatment plant recently reduced the chlorine
9	there for national security reasons. So I think the
10	chemical issues in a floodplain also are not only a
11	hazard to people but also to aquatic environment if
12	the water should go into the Potomac.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Any questions
14	for Ms. Albers? Did you turn in your two cards to the
15	reporter? All right. Anybody else? Mr. Hannaham?
16	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Excuse me, madam.
17	Could you just clarify the uses of chlorine in this
18	particular function?
19	MS. ALBERS: I can't clarify it. You
20	would have to have Georgetown clarify it. It's just a
21	question I have. I would assume that if there are
22	people in a pool, that you would need to have some
23	sort of disinfecting thing. So that's something you
24	would have to clarify with them.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM:

25

This is people

1	physically, their bodies, in the water, is what you're
2	saying?
3	MS. ALBERS: I think you should clarify it
4	with them.
5	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. Thank you.
6	Thank you very much.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I can tell we're
8	going to have fun tonight. We will keep the record in
9	this case open until this Friday.
10	Yes?
11	MS. GIORDANO: We can address that issue
12	now, if you'd like, or we can address it in the next
13	case.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'd rather you
15	address it in the next case, please, because I'm sure
16	there will be more.
17	We will leave the record open in this
18	until this coming Friday, the 23rd, at 3:00 p.m. So
19	if anyone has any inspirations about the text
20	amendment, as we go through the evening, there will be
21	an additional opportunity for you to weigh in in
22	writing.
23	As I said earlier, if we take affirmative
24	action on the text amendment, we will be advertising
25	that for a period. Allowing a period of time for

comments, we will advertise that in the D.C. Register.

And then we make a referral to NCPC.

So that closes out the first case of the evening, which is 02-31.

(7:14 p.m.)

Now we will move to CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: the second case, which is why most of you are here, which is case number 02-30. This is a request by Georgetown and the National Park Service for a zoning map amendment under chapter 30 of the District of Columbia zoning regulations for tract 102-114, parcel fronting on the Potomac River vacant approximately one-quarter mile west of the Key Bridge. As I said earlier, the two proposals are for W-1 with the text amendment we just heard or W-0.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on March 21, 2003. And this hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 30-22, which are the rules of procedures for contested cases.

The hearing announcement for this case is also available in the wall bin near the door. The order of procedure in this case will be as follows. We will begin with preliminary matters followed by the applicant's presentation, report by the Office of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	Planning, reports of any other government agencies,
2	the report of the affected ANC, which in this case is
3	2E, parties and persons in support, parties and
4	persons in opposition.
5	The following time constraints will be
6	maintained in this hearing. The petitioner I believe
7	will take no more than one hour and hopefully less.
8	Parties will have approximately 15 minutes for their
9	presentations. Organizations again will have five
10	minutes. And individuals will have three minutes.
11	Everything I said in terms of the witness
12	cards and not talking to the Commission off the record
13	and all of that still applies in this case.
14	And now we will consider any preliminary
15	matters. And among those are requests for party
16	status. Mr. Bastida, is there anything else?
17	PRELIMINARY MATTERS
18	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, Madam Chairman.
19	As I previously stated, the applicant has complied
20	with the requirements of posting and making up a
21	posting. The staff believes that the Commission can
22	proceed regarding advertisement.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
24	Bastida.

Now this evening, in case number 02-30, we

1	have three requests for party status. The first is
2	Lawrence Schuette on behalf of the Washington Canoe
3	Club. We have Frederick Mopsik, which I apologize if
4	I mispronounce that, for The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal
5	Association; and Ernie Brooks for the Coalition for
6	the Capital Crescent Trail.
7	We can take them individually or
8	collectively as suits the Commission. Mr. Hood?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I
10	wouldn't have a problem with granting all three of
11	those party status. And the reason why I am not a
12	subject matter expert on this, but I think I have more
13	expertise obviously from reading the submittals that
14	definitely will help me out from this Commission's
15	standpoint.
16	So I have no problems in all three being
17	granted party status.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Any
19	objections?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Without objection,
22	the three requests for party status will be granted.
23	When we do cross-examination, we will take the ANC
24	first. Then we will take Mr. Schuette, Mr. Mopsik,
25	Mr. Brooks. Is everyone here? Okay. Everyone is

here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. I guess we are ready. If no one else has any preliminary matters, we are ready to proceed with the applicant's presentation.

### PRESENTATION OF APPLICANT'S CASE

MS. GIORDANO: Cynthia Giordano again for the applicant. While we are setting up, I am going to go ahead and get started by just identifying our witnesses for you.

have number of witnesses this evening. Alan Brangman, the university architect, Georgetown University, is our first witnesses; Sally Blumenthal, representing the National Park Service; Tony Johnson, the head coach of the Georgetown University crew team; and then from the private architects of the project, Stephen Muse and William Kirwan from Muse Architects; and then Nate Gross from Arnold and Porter.

The subject of this hearing, as you have indicated, is the mapping of the property. And concurrent with that, the W-O zone allows for a simultaneous application, consideration of a special exception.

We are requesting two special exceptions: one for a boathouse under the W-0 zone, which is the

38 1 preferred zone by the Office of Planning; secondly, for a reduction to zero for the parking requirements 2 3 for the boathouse. And then we also are requesting a variance from the setback requirements to reduce the 4 5 setback from 20 to 15 feet from the waterfront. If we are ready? Mr. Brangman, are you 6 7 We will just launch right in to our ready to begin? 8 presentation. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please do.

MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you. Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Commission.

#### STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES

MR. BRANGMAN: My name is Alan Brangman. I'm university architect for Georgetown University. Tonight I would like to give the Commission a very brief understanding of Georgetown's history with respect to the proposed boathouse facility on tract 102-114.

GU has been seeking a new home for its men's and women's crew program for a number of years. In 1991, Georgetown through a gift from CSX Railroad received a parcel of land approximately one mile west of the current proposed site. This parcel, tract 102-109, is 1.09 acres and includes an access easement which is 15 feet wide which runs from the base of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Water Street to that particular site.

2.0

The easement was part of the old CSX rail bed adjacent to the Capital Crescent Trail. This parcel is currently zoned CM-1 and could accommodate the development of a boathouse facility.

Georgetown entered into discussions with the National Park Service to explore the possibility of exchanging our property for a piece of property that was designated within the boathouse zone as it was articulated by the Georgetown waterfront study.

The university and the National Park Service focused their discussion on tract 102-114, located just west of the Washington Canoe Club. The university and the National Park Service culminated their discussions with an agreement to not only define the steps necessary to exchange the two properties but also to set a number of restrictions on the property with respect to Georgetown's ability to develop that property.

The university agreed to build within a certain footprint, within a certain height, and within a certain aesthetic, with certain programmatic elements specific to non-motorized boathouses, to restrict parking from the site, and to accommodate an 84-inch sewer, which currently runs below the site.

The university's initial feasibility study found that the site was developable.

Muse Architects, whom you will hear from later this evening, was commissioned by the university to develop a set of design plans for a non-motorized boathouse consistent with boathouses found on the Schuylkill River in Philadelphia and along the Charles River in Cambridge, Mass.

The boathouse designed to date has been reviewed by groups such as the Georgetown Professional Business Association and the Georgetown Waterfront Commission. The project has received formal reviews from ANC 2E, the old Georgetown Board, and the Commission on Fine Arts. All of these agencies have given the project unanimous support.

The project has also been reviewed by FEMA, WASA, NCPC, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the C&O Canal Commission. The university also met with the Washington Canoe Club on at least three occasions. The university has listened to and accommodated many of the recommendations that were put forth by these groups and incorporated as part of our plans.

The project documents have been on hold, as you know, since August of 2002 and will be submitted to DCRA for further review with respect to

2.0

1	environmental concerns and building permit concerns,
2	building code concerns once this process is completed.
3	The university has worked to provide a
4	well-planned and designed facility that will add an
5	aesthetically pleasing and appropriate boathouse
6	facility to the Georgetown waterfront. The building
7	and its functions will help to animate the river in a
8	way which is entirely consistent with the Georgetown
9	waterfront's park plans.
10	On behalf of Georgetown University, I
11	would like to request approval of the Georgetown
12	boathouse as it is proposed. And I am happy to answer
13	any questions that the Commission may have.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're going to hold
15	our questions. But I am going to ask, would you guys
16	just shut the clock off for a second? In all of my
17	efforts to move this along, I neglected to swear
18	everyone in.
19	So anyone who would like to testify this
20	evening and I know Mr. Brangman is going to make a
21	special oath that he just told the truth. Anybody who
22	plans on testifying this evening please rise now to
23	take the oath.
24	(Whereupon, witnesses in the cases were

duly sworn.)

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now we're ready to have the clock back on. Keep going. 2 3 MS. GIORDANO: Our next witness is Sally 4 Blumenthal from the National Park Service. 5 MS. **BLUMENTHAL:** Good evening, Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. 6 My name is 7 Sally Blumenthal. I represent the National Park 8 Service. We are a co-applicant and the landowner in 9 this case. 10 I was last before you for the W-O zone, 11 which we are very enthusiastic about, as you know. 12 What I would like to share with you tonight is the 13 context in which the Georgetown University boathouse, 14 the environment that it will be in in the 15 not-too-distant future. 16 We have been working for more than 20 17 years to come up with a plan for the Georgetown 18 waterfront. And we have finally gotten there. 19 is the Key Bridge right here. This is Washington 2.0 Harbor right there. The District of Columbia transferred this 21 22 ten acres to us in 1999. It's the largest addition to 23 the park system of the nation's capital in years. 24 have been planning this for nearly 20 years. What it 25 does is complete the McMillan Commission's vision for

a system of riverfront parks in the nation's capital.

A major goal of our planning process has been the accommodation of non-motorized boating. We currently manage Thompson's Boat Center, which is just off this drawing down at the mouth of Rock Creek.

But also within this vicinity is the Potomac Boat Club, which is right there. That is a privately owned boat club on private property and will remain so, even though it's within the boundary of the park, and the Washington Canoe Club, which is also upstream of the Key Bridge.

When we went through the planning process in the 1980s and received the approvals of the Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board, the ANC, and ultimately the City Council with the transfer of this property to the Park Service, a boathouse zone was established from 34th Street up to just above the Washington Canoe Club, which is where we believe boathouses should be cited. We have been fostering boating in this part of the river for quite some time.

The idea of Georgetown University's boathouse is very much part of this process. The university owns a piece of property upstream, about a mile upstream, which shows in this aerial photograph.

2.0

There is the Key Bridge. There is the canoe club, the proposed site, and the property that Georgetown University owns a mile upstream and owns not only the land but the right of access on the Capital Crescent Trail for a mile.

In fact, they have a National Park Service key to what's called a dead man. You probably know what a dead man is. It's a bollard that falls down so trucks can pass. They own that right of passage.

We entered into a land exchange with Georgetown University for two reasons. We wanted to, first and foremost, acquire this piece of property, which is an environmentally sensitive piece of property; and also to extinguish the right of access for a mile over the Capital Crescent Trail.

We also wanted to achieve the goal of our boathouse zone and fostering non-motorized boating on the river. And we negotiated an agreement, which Alan has described and which you will have more description of, wherein we would exchange property we owned just above the canoe club for the property they owned. And the easement would also be extinguished.

In order to facilitate this land exchange, which is like a contract, we agreed with Georgetown that we would not convey deeds until they have

2.0

indications that they would have the requisite approvals to construct on that site, which include zoning. It's unzoned now. So without the zoning, this cannot proceed and would run counter to the Park Service's goal for this part of the waterfront.

Bill, if you could move my drawings? Well, just leave me that one minute. It's been suggested that perhaps there would be an alternative site for Georgetown to build, which would be in this location here, which is south of 34th Street.

As we went through our public process in the last year, that idea was surfaced in the community with I would say incredibly strong opposition.

I would like to enter into the record a resolution from CAG, the Citizens Association of Georgetown, in opposition to boathouses below Key Bridge. They ultimately agreed as we moved this plan through the process that, in fact, the one site below Key Bridge was a viable site. So I would like to enter this into the record.

We will actually be back, hopefully in the not-too-distant future, looking for a rezoning of this parcel. We are in negotiations and early discussions with George Washington University, who is equally desirous of a boathouse. And if we can conclude that

favorably, we will be seeking with George Washington 1 University zoning for that site as well. 2 I would like to say one other thing that I 3 find somewhat ironic. And that is this notion that 4 5 Georgetown's use of public property is inappropriate as a boathouse. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could I just ask you 8 to just focus on what is before us because I did 9 caution the folks that are here that we're not going 10 to discuss the propriety of the land swap? So I would 11 just as soon just focus on the rezonings that are 12 proposed. 13 MS. BLUMENTHAL: Fine. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 14 15 MS. BLUMENTHAL: I'll be happy to do that. 16 I would like to offer a different perspective on the 17 chlorine issue that was brought up in connection with 18 the rowing tank. I would like to point out that there 19 are a number of swimming pools and fountains managed 2.0 National Park Service which are by the the 21 floodplain. And it's not an issue. 22 All of the fountains that are in the 23 monumental core that are in the floodplain, the water in those fountains is all chemically treated. 24 25 are swimming pools in Anacostia Park and East Potomac

Park, which are also in the floodplain. And I do not believe that is an issue. At least we don't see it as an issue, which would go certainly to the boathouse.

MS. GIORDANO: Thank you, Ms. Blumenthal.

At this point we will move on to our third witness, Mr. Johnson, who is the head coach of the Georgetown University crew team.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I'm the one if you ask questions about the rowing tanks, I can answer them.

I wanted to spend a little time to first talk about the site and the appropriateness of the site. The site that we had acquired from upriver, a mile upriver, while it will work and it is suitable for a boathouse in terms of access to the river and so on, as a user of the river, a constant user of the river, it is so clearly well within the Potomac Palisades that we knew immediately that we and everybody else, the public, would be much better off if we did not build up there.

And so when we looked at the boathouse zone that was identified by the Park Service, this was the only site that we thought was appropriate for a boathouse for Georgetown that would be a footprint large enough to accommodate the footprint that we

2.0

acquired for our purposes.

2.0

When you're upriver at that other site, you are within an area where there are times when you don't see anything manmade. And it's really beautiful, and we thought it should stay that way.

The site downriver is one that will allow -- our students' means of access will either be by foot or on bike. There is no need for vehicular traffic for the normal comings and goings through the boathouse. So when the Park Service in the agreement asked us to not have parking, we knew we could do with that.

There is a plan for access on the bike trail. Do you have that? When we were talking about being a mile upriver from Key Bridge, there was no choice over that entire corridor but to ride on originally what was the rails and now is the bike trail.

But in the lower end, this 200 yards, 300 yards, whatever it is from Aqueduct Bridge to our site, our access can be divided from the actual bike trail. The bike trail is on the upper end there in the gray.

The idea would be that the actual design of that and the layout of this is still something of a

discussion point with the Park Service, the C&O Canal, and with the bike enthusiasts that use the trail.

The idea was to move the trail so that our access when needed either by students who were going in by foot or needed for access for any number of purposes, whether it's garbage collection or delivery or whatever, could be on a different trail and not have to drive on it at all. That would include whenever we are either picking shells up or picking them up and bringing them back or whichever we were going with them.

The turnaround at the far end of the facility is required by the fire marshal for emergency vehicles that would be at the far end of the building.

That will also suit us fine for a turnaround area for our trailers and shells.

The program for the boathouse was one that we wanted. Georgetown has wanted for years to have a facility comparable to other universities that we compete with. And those are primarily universities from the Mid-Atlantic area through New England. Alan Brangman mentioned that we visited boathouses from Philadelphia up to Boston.

The components, the basic components, the program for the facility is one that was negotiated

2.0

first by ourselves and then with the National Park Service and then with the architect.

It's some very basic components: the shell storage, the rowing tank, locker rooms, a training area. There's one office, which will be a shared office by several coaches, and then some smaller team rooms, meeting rooms, perhaps a visiting team locker room as well.

Those are similar components to other boathouses, again, of universities that we compete with. There are boathouses of universities that we compete against that are much larger.

There are really 16 universities that I'm speaking of, including Georgetown. So the other 15, there's a few of those that are distinctly larger. There's one that is distinctly smaller. And the others are very similar in size to what we're talking about in terms of the boat storage areas.

The universities that are able to have a boathouse near their campus and are able, therefore, to do all of their training, their rowing, their winter training, fall training, whatever, on site have pretty much these same components.

If they have a long distance to travel to the boathouse, a 20 or 30-minute travel, then none of

2.0

those boathouses have a rowing tank at the boathouse because they do want to train at certain times of the year back on campus.

I would add that the rowing tank serves several purposes. One of them, the primary one, is a teaching tool. It is not used just in the winter. It's used at any time that you want to teach somebody, whether it's one person or a whole group of people, something about their strokes, something about how they row.

The one part of this plan that I had envisioned for years before we hired an architect, before we got into this was to have a rowing tank in an area where it could be seen so that others that are going by, walking by, in this case on the bike trail, will be able to see what this sport is, will be able and encouraged to ask and look and perhaps to take part in it.

So the rowing tank is basically a room on the north side against the bike trail and on the river side has a lot of glass wall to it. That's to hopefully make this sport which people can enjoy on the river something that is a little closer and a little easier for them to see and get a little better grasp for it.

2.0

Hopefully they will ask and want to take part in it as well, but it is not something that we would use only in the wintertime. The same is true with our rowing machines.

We use those things year-round in our training. They're individual tools. They're teaching tools. And in order to have good crew, a good rowing program, you have to be able to do those things that allow you to teach well.

Most of the students at Georgetown that row are students who learn the sport at the university. And a first-class facility, as we have planned, will just be enormously helpful and popular and better for us.

There are some other issues with regard to the use of the river that show on this map on this picture on the left. Years ago, there was so little rowing on the river, rowing and canoeing, that although the rowers and the canoers followed some basic guidelines for traffic patterns, they were pretty loosely followed.

As the river has become more crowded, -- I want to be careful how I saw this -- it has become more crowded, but there is just so much room on this great river for this sport that we have an enormous

2.0

amount of room as long as we manage it properly.

2.0

It's like having a parking lot. If you didn't have any lines at all and people went everywhere, on a Sunday morning when you are all by yourself, you could go anywhere. But normally you have enough people out there on the highway that you have to pay attention to right-hand traffic patterns, et cetera, et cetera.

The rowers' traffic pattern, from whether they start downriver or wherever, is to come up through the second arch on Key Bridge. And that first long line that Bill Kirwan is pointing to is a right-hand line so that crews that are going upriver go through that second arch. They point up to be clear of those islands which are at the top of that line and keep right.

And the other line, somewhat parallel to it, is a return coming back downriver. And it's as if we had lines on the highway. Those crews coming downriver would point to a separate arch.

The prime issue for Washington Canoe Club is that since we are upstream of their facility, we are in the area that previously there had been no traffic, no rowing traffic. I should also step back.

There are users on the river. There are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

the rowers and the paddlers. And then there is an enormous number of other people that pay no attention whatsoever to any of the rules that we might have. And so although the rowers and the paddlers, when we're out there training, we have traffic patterns in mind, we always have to be mindful of a fisherman or some other recreational user that goes wherever they want to go, as they should be able to.

The primary times of our training, both for rowing and canoeing, are times when we don't see many of those people. And we do try to pay attention to these traffic patterns.

Back to the point. We are just upstream of the Washington Canoe Club with this proposed site.

And, therefore, we are in the lanes that the canoers normally use. And all we have to do in my mind is learn to share this beautiful river.

It is front of our boathouse and in front of Washington Canoe Club about 1,000 feet wide. It is from our proposed dock out to that line of traffic for rowing shells just about 100 meters, 300 feet plus.

I believe all we need to do is demarcate a lane, an area where rowers coming and going to our dock will not sit in the way of canoers who are using those inner lanes. And we can do that if we can get

2.0

the approval from the proper agencies by putting a line of buoys down that our crews would just off that race course.

It will work. The river is wide enough. There is room to do all of these things. The Washington Canoe Club has a race course, which is constricted by the width of the river right behind the sisters, between the sisters and shore.

What we laid out on this map is a race course that is 50 meters wide, which is shore to rock at the sisters. And it fits in easily clear of our dock, clear of the Washington Canoe Club, and well clear of the rowing lanes.

The depth of the river, the use of the river for rowing is fine. The river was suggested that it might need to be dredged. The river has never been dredged, as far as I know, ever. And I see no reason why it ever would need to be in that area. It is a beautiful river to row on for either the coaches or the launches.

We have planned and worked and raised funds to build a facility that we want to have to be first-class. We want it to be beautiful. We want the public to appreciate it, to enjoy it, to see it, just as you do now if you drive down the George Washington

2.0

Parkway or if you're out on the river and you look over at Washington Canoe Club, Potomac Boat Club.

We want a Georgetown University facility that not only we can take pride in but the public can as well. We want a facility that for our students and for teaching and training our crews will be first-class, that they will feel a great pride in. And hopefully they can accomplish more, says the coach.

I think that's -- yes. I'm sorry. Year in, year out, and at different times of the year, the numbers of students that are rowing at Georgetown vary. We have squads for men and women, heavyweight and lightweight. And that adds up to eight for first year students, novice students, and upper class. So there are basically eight squads.

We have those eight squads now. Although our numbers are restricted some by the size and the room that we have at Thompson's Boat Center, the basic components that we have, that's it. That's what we're going to have.

In the springtime, in the racing season, the number of students would vary from perhaps a lot of about 130 to a high of 140 or 150. Those numbers of students might be slightly higher in this new

facility if we can encourage and keep more.

2.0

In the fall, when we're teaching new people on the river, in the rowing tank, and on the ergometers, I might add, when we're teaching them, the numbers are much higher for that few weeks, four, five, six weeks in the early fall. And then the numbers decrease some.

The rowing tank itself, yes, a rowing tank, first, they are of different sizes, the number of persons that you might have. This is the first floor diagram. The right-hand wing is the tank wing. The center section and the left-hand wing are for storage of rowing shells.

The tank in this case, what we have proposed has a circular pool of water. Basically it's a trough of water, four or five feet wide. And that's where the oar goes.

There are rowing tanks that are made that are non-motorized. The rowers that sit in them as they row, they propel the water. It circulates in a design such as this. And there are other tanks that are motorized. We hope very much that we can motorize it with the motors out of the floodplain, which can be done.

The rowing tank, people do not get in it.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

They should not get in it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Laughter.)

MR. JOHNSON: There is no need to. If you have seen an exercise rowing machine in a gymnasium or a gym, the apparatus that they sit on and row on is very similar. They have an oar, which in this case is not in a boat. It's on solid platform. And the oar lock and then out where the end of the blade is, that's in the pool of water.

We can simulate the rowing motion. We can teach the rowing motion. We can refine it. We can work on it. And that is terribly important to us ultimately for our purpose of speed.

The rowing tank because it is not something that the people get into, it does need to have some -- you don't have to, but you ought to try and keep it clean. Algae will grow in it, although the water as you take it out of the tap also has chlorine in it, I might add.

We have looked at various means of how we will clean this rowing tank. The Georgetown University swimming pool just went from chlorine-clean system to some other means. I am not familiar with it, but I know it's not chlorine.

I know that we are dealing with what we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

	59
1	have estimated I asked the tank manufacturer
2	would be about 11,000 gallons in this tank. And a
3	common backyard residential pool would have not quite
4	3 times that many gallons.
5	The amount of water that goes over Little
6	Falls on a weekend like this past weekend when there
7	was eight feet of water going over is something in the
8	magnitude of 80,000 gallons per second. In a flood
9	stage, I assume it's twice that or more.
10	If our tank should be flooded, our 11,000
11	gallons of water, which hopefully is not cleaned by
12	chlorine, would join all the water that is flushed
13	down our toilets into our combined system in the
14	Potomac River and join that whatever, 80,000 gallons
15	times whatever per second, in the river.
16	We would hope that we can find a means of
17	cleaning the pool without using chlorine because it
18	will be less caustic to breathe, to be around. And we
19	see no need for that. There are no other chemicals or
20	things that are to be stored in the boat, as there
21	aren't in any other boathouse on the river already.
22	Thank you.

MS. GIORDANO: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Next we will have a presentation from the architects, Mr. Muse and Mr. Kirwan.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

23

24

MR. MUSE: Thank you very much. I am Stephen Muse. I am the senior principal of Muse Architects here in Washington, D.C. We are the architects for the new boathouse.

In presenting our design for this boathouse, I am going to talk about three issues. The first is the program of the building, which Tony has talked about a little bit already. The second is the design of the site and the building plan for this new structure. And the third is the image that we have in mind for what this building will look like.

Starting with this program, the program for this building has four basic parts. The first are the boat bays. In this building, there are five of these. This is for the storage of the shells. One of these boat bays doubles as a shod.

When dealing with these boat bays, we find that they come in set sizes of about 23 feet wide and about 78 feet deep. This is tied to having circulation down the middle and storage on both sides.

The height of these bays is 14 feet tall. This is also tied to the storage of the shells on the side and also the storage of the oars. The oars are stored vertically. They need the 14-feet height to be stored in their racks.

2.0

These boat bays come in two orientations. Some that we see are set at 90 degrees to the river, and the shells are taken down to the river, turned at that point, and placed in the water. Others we find are parallel to the river. And the shells are taken out and walked to the river, simply placed in the water. Both of these types are acceptable, and you will see that we have both types in this new building.

The second part is the indoor rowing tank. As Tony has mentioned, this is a teaching tool. That allows 24 athletes to train at the same time. Once again, this comes in a set size of 46 feet wide and 93 feet long. That is the minimum size to space the athletes and have the smallest turning radius we can to move the water inside the tank.

Because these are the spaces that are located on the ground floor, this sets the footprint or sets the size of the footprint for this building.

Above these on the second floor, we have the second two parts of the program. We have the men's and women's locker rooms. We have 90 spots per side. And with an appropriate bathroom for each, this gives us spaces of 34 feet wide and 80 feet long for each. We also have an exercise room, which is 40 feet wide and 72 feet long.

2.0

As Tony mentioned, there are a few other spaces. There is an office. There is a team room. There are a couple of other minor spaces. But primarily those four major uses that I've talked about set the program for this building. When you put all of this together, it is approximately 33,000 square feet of space.

Now, given this kit of parts of these rooms that tend to come in set sizes, the question becomes, how do you arrange them on the site? The approach that we took was, rather than grouping them as one single mass, we have divided them into three wings that are connected by hyphens.

We feel that this allows us to do several things. Number one, it allows us to create open space between the building and the river. This space will be kept green. This space is not fenced in. Those on the bike path are encouraged to walk out to the river; experience the river; and, as Tony has mentioned, see what the Georgetown rowing program is about.

Should you choose not to walk out to the water, you do walk directly past the rowing tank, which is glassed on three sides. So from the bike path, once again, you can look and see the rowing tank and see the rowers in action. You actually can look

2.0

all the way through this room and out to the river.

The second reason that we broke this into the three parts was to create an entry facade when you arrive at this building from the east. These boathouse buildings have two scales. One is seen from the river, which is quite far away. The second one is seen as you arrive either by bike or walk from the east. This gives us a smaller scale facade that is pointed in that direction.

The third reason for not doing this as only single mass but dividing it into three wings is to reduce the scale of this building. Bill, put that up, the waterfront elevation.

What we are doing is stepping down from a higher roof in a center to lower roofs on the sides. We start at 54 feet from the ridge in the center of this building. We step down to 41 feet, the ridge of the wings, again to 32 feet at the ridge of the entry, which is the same height as the Washington Canoe Club. The hyphens in between these separate parts are 34 feet tall.

Now, the image of this building, this building has been designed in the traditional shingle style. It's a style that is found in many boathouses.

As Tony mentioned, when he first started this

2.0

	64
1	project, we took a tour of I think every boathouse
2	between Philadelphia and Boston. It is the
3	predominant style that you find in waterfront
4	structures.
5	What gives it this style is its very
6	traditional gabled forms that we have collected in the
7	wings. The ground floor, the material is fieldstone.
8	The second floor and the roof, it is wood shingle.
9	It has traditional doors and windows. And on the
10	river side, it has traditional porches.
11	In conclusion, following presentations to
12	many local groups, the design of this project was
13	extremely well-received and was approved by the old
14	Georgetown Board and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts.
15	Now Bill is going to go into other issues
16	about this building.
17	MR. KIRWAN: Thank you, Stephen.
18	My name is William Kirwan. I'm a
19	principal at Muse Architects. I'm going to be talking
20	to you a little bit today about constructability
21	issues as well as the reviews, both environmental and
22	design, that we have been through on this project to
23	date.
24	The access to the site, as Tony has

described, is via the easement that Georgetown has

parallel to the Capital Crescent Bike Trail. That is a 12-foot-wide easement.

We are going to be moving the bike trail to the north slightly to allow Georgetown to have their easement independent from the bike trail users. That was done in negotiation and coordination with National Park Service and the Capital Crescent Trail Commission.

right-of-way will That also be the construction entrance to the site. And that will be, again, along that 12-foot right-of-way. That will be continually monitored by the contractor during construction to ensure the safety of the users of the bike trail while the building is being built. all of this layout, again, has been discussed with National Park Service and the C&O Canal Commission all the way through the design process.

The construction of the building I'm now going to touch upon a little bit and give you some points on that. The building will be built on a pile foundation. That means the piles will be drilled down into the earth to a point where they reach bearing.

This is being done utilizing what is called an auger-cast piling. That means they're taking a drill, drilling down into the earth, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

pulling that drill out as they pump the concrete. That is being done to minimize the vibration of the construction of this building because there is an 84-inch sewer main which is running right trough the middle of the site. That is a sewer main that is operated by WASA. And to be able to build over that, we have to encase that sewer main and build our building above it after it has been encased.

So, again, the auger-type piles are being used to both ensure the safety and the construction of the existing sewer main. That will also have a trickle-down effect in regards to the safety during construction of other neighboring structures, both the canal as well as the Washington Canoe Club, during construction. So we will not be driving piles, as is a very common method seen on the waterfront, but actually drilling them down into the earth one at a time.

We will also be utilizing modular building components throughout construction. Again, that is due to the location and the difficult access to the site. We will be building this, as Stephen mentioned, out of masonry. We will be using stone and with the concrete block back up, again, to work with small parts that can be brought to the site in batches and

2.0

put up one at a time. We will also be using stick framing, again, a modular-type method where we're using traditional wood framing methods, to build this building. So, again, materials can be brought to the site in portions. And it can be built as it goes up.

The general contractor for this project is Whiting-Turner Construction. Use architects in Whiting-Turner have experience on a number of projects dealing with difficult sites with difficult constraints.

One such project is the Lab School of Washington at Reservoir and MacArthur. There we had a very small site where we basically doubled the size of the existing campus on that location. We had to deal with both keeping that school open all the way during and through construction as well as maintaining all of the public rights-of-way on MacArthur Boulevard as well as White Haven Parkway all through that process in order to make sure that all of the things that had to be done to get that building built did not affect both the neighbors as well as the school operation.

I will touch upon the design and environmental review process that we have undertaken to date. We began this project as we begin all projects in the office, which is to engage the various

2.0

agencies that are going to be involved in the review of the project at the earliest possible point in the design.

We began this design on this project in June of 2001. In September of 2001, we began to set up meetings with DCRA, D.C. Environmental Group, as well as the old Georgetown Board, Commission of Fine Arts. So by September of 2001, we had already begun to undertake those meetings.

Stephen had already mentioned the old Georgetown Board and the Commission of Fine Arts. We also began engaging the Office of DCRA. They have a program where they have a preliminary design review process.

We have undertaken two meetings with them to date, one in September of 2001 and a second one in October of 2002. At those meetings, we met with DCRA officials to ensure that the building metes all of the life safety and construction code requirements for that building.

They have reviewed the building. They have given us the preliminary go-ahead on all of the different parts of it. And we have all the information we need to complete our documents to make a permit filing to them.

2.0

1 Environmental issues. In 2002, we met with George Harrison of the Army Corps of 2 We walked the site with him, brought our 3 Engineers. 4 drawings, and showed him the proposed development. 5 We presented these documents to him in addition to documents that he had been involved in 6 7 during the agreement with the Park Service. document called a "Finding of No Significant Impact." 8 9 He reviewed that document while we were on 10 He reconfirmed that the environmental 11 issues that were dispelled in this document are still 12 not an impediment to the proposed development. 13 He also provided general acceptance of the 14 project and provided requirements for the approval of 15 the shoreline stabilization that we proposed as well 16 as the dock design. 17 then had meetings with the permit 18 ambassador program at DCRA. They provided us with 19 information that if a finding of no significant impact 2.0 did exist, that an environmental impact statement, 21 which is typical of projects of this scale, was not 22 required in the permit submission. 23 We had meetings with Mr. Karikari of the

requirements

Environmental Regulatory Agency. He provided us with

for

protection

the

design

24

25

of

the

watershed. This included filtration systems of all impervious surface runoff that we were employing in our design and a super self-fence protection system of the river throughout the construction of the building.

It is also to note that DCRA will also be monitoring the project all the way through construction, as they do on projects of this scale and scope.

We have also had this project reviewed by FEMA. The only additional information that they

FEMA. The only additional information that they required after review of our project was a calculation that this will not increase the base flood elevation, the 100-year base flood elevation, for the river by more than a foot. And they have ensured us that that should not be a problem.

In conclusion, we have sought out every agency that will be reviewing this project and have received the necessary concept approvals and the additional information requirements necessary to complete the documents and receive a construction permit.

Thank you.

MS. GIORDANO: Thank you.

Last, but not least, Mr. Gross will address the special exception and variance criteria and some of the zoning aspects of the proposal.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

MR. GROSS: Thank you.

2.0

The Commission has our application for W-0 and special exception requests dated March 13th, I believe, as Ms. Giordano mentioned at the outset. We have a special exception to waive the parking request, a special exception for the use, and a variance from the waterfront setback requirement.

I would like to begin pointing out that the project is a matter of right in terms of the area standards under either the W-O or the W-I zone. And we have the one variance request.

I would like to begin with the parking exception under the W-O, which states that all or a part of the parking requirement can be waived provided alternatives to dedicated parking exist and are available to the proposed boathouse with minimal impact on adjacent land or development.

Our response to that, on page 8 of our statement, is that there is no street access to the property. And, therefore, motor vehicle parking is obviously impossible, also prohibited by the exchange agreement in the interest of maintaining the most natural possible setting.

Third, given the immediate proximity to the university campus and the fact that the rowers

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

already walk or bike to Thompson's boathouse for practice and events, that will be the same system here.

In a separate place in the W-0, there is a requirement for a parking management plan. That is addressed on pages 10 and 11 of our statement. I would like to move to that because it fits in with the parking waiver.

The parking management plan is required for infrequent special events, such as regattas. And Georgetown's plan is as follows. All students in Georgetown's crew team will either walk or bicycle to the site.

Visitors and visiting crew teams will be shuttled to K Street, a short walking distance to the boathouse along the Capital Crescent Trail. The team of visiting crews will park on the campus for the duration of the regatta after dropping off team members.

Patrons will be encouraged to park on campus and utilize the shuttle or walk to the boathouse from the campus. A critical point on that in terms of the gatherance of people is that the finish line of these regattas is down by Thompson's boathouse.

The races start up at the Georgetown boathouse. So the gathering of people will tend to be down by, what do you call it, Georgetown Harbor and Thompson's boathouse and the pedestrian walkways in that vicinity.

And in that vicinity were any members of the public who want to see the regatta. You're already in a commercial area with restaurants and office space and condominiums and the usual Georgetown neighborhood animation.

So we based on those principles request a waiver of the parking requirement. We believe it is a workable situation. The variance request waterfront setback as to the unique conditions practical difficulty upon the property if the requirement is met, we indicate that obviously the proximity to the water is critical for a boathouse. You just have to get the boats in the water. a fairly minor difference between what is proposed and what the regulations are requiring.

One of the critical site constraints is the narrowness of the site. Basically it backs up to the Capital Crescent Trail. And there is a right-of-way there. And so the boathouse is basically set back as far as it can before coming up against the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Capital Crescent Trail.

Then, finally, you have the seven-foot-in-diameter underground sewer main that significantly affects construction on the site. Those are the constraints regarding the waterfront setback.

I do want to correct an error on my part in the statement of March 13th at the top of page 9. I misunderstood something at that time in stating here that Georgetown will not be able to provide public access to the waterfront or between the boathouse and the water. That is not correct. There will be complete public access. I might point out there is a chain link fence around the Washington Canoe Club next door, which is a different kind of facility perhaps, but this will have public access.

The goal of the waterfront setback, as I understand it, in the W-O zone was so that people of the public walking along the waterfront would be able to proceed unimpeded.

Then the special exception for the boathouse use itself, there are four criteria set froth in paragraph 917.1v. I would like to proceed with number 2 and then 4 and then 1 and 3. Anyway, criterion 2 states, "The facility shall not result in fill of normally submerged areas and shall minimize

excavation to that reasonably required."

2.0

We respond that there will be no fill of normally submerged areas and excavation is minimized given the construction technique of using augers for the pilings that Mr. Kirwan just testified about.

Four requires off-street parking according to normal standards. We have utilized a request for the special exception under W-O to waive the parking.

Criteria 1 and 3, "Facility shall be designed to enhance the visual and recreational opportunities along the waterfront and shall be located so as not likely to become objectionable to surrounding nearby property because of noise, traffic, or parking" and not to limit access along or to the waterfront.

In regard to those, as far as enhancing the visual quality, the high endorsement of the Commission of Fine Arts speaks well to that. They were, among other things, looking at elevations as viewed from the water with the Washington Canoe Club existing structure and the proposed boathouse side by side.

Those last two criteria really go to the public purpose rationale, which is the concluding section of our W-1 application as well as W-0. I will

just highlight those. I won't take a lot of your time, Madam Chair.

First, low-impact recreational use of the waterfront, no adverse effects on neighboring This is a recreational use that will property. animate this part of the waterfront. Most of the site an actual condition. remain in recreational use, which is highly compatible with park use, will add some interest along the waterfront for bikers and hikers and others.

If you look at exhibit B, the photograph that we provided, the bottom one shows a photograph from the Capital Crescent Trail through a grassy part of the site with Key Bridge in the background. And you can see the fence of the Washington Canoe Club at the left.

This grassy part of the site, unlike the trees, in terms of views to the water and of Key Bridge, which are mentioned in some of the letters in opposition, this is exactly where the 50-foot side yard between the boathouse structure of Georgetown and the property line of the Washington Canoe Club will fall. So this view across the grassland and to the river and Key Bridge will remain because of the side yard setback.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And, of course, the boathouse use generates very little noise. It is part of a plan, a federal recreational plan, really, developed by the National Park Service and endorsed by the National Capital Planning Commission, incorporated in the Georgetown waterfront park plan with a boathouse zone and four boathouse sites, including this one. there has been a lot of planning for this as a recreational use along the water.

Second, consistency with a comprehensive The comprehensive plan at section 1115.1c under plan. "Public and Institutional Land Use Objectives," calls for the District of Columbia to engage in waterfront planning "capitalize unrealized and to on opportunities for creating exciting and imaginative waterfront-focused recreation" and that "new development should enhance the physical and environmental quality of the rivers and adjoining areas."

Third, the Ward 2 element of the comprehensive plan calls for the city to work with the National Park Service to ensure that Ward 2 waterfront areas, including Georgetown, Maine Avenue, Buzzard Point, and along the Anacostia provide public access and use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	I'm almost done. Federal element under
2	"Natural Features and Recreation on Waterfront"
3	states, "All lands within 150 to 200 feet of the
4	water's edge along the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers
5	should be managed in a manner that will encourage the
6	enjoyment and recreational use of water resources
7	while protecting the scenic values of the waterways."
8	The generalized land use map indicates
9	recreation and open space. This use is actually a
10	combination of both in that the easement will require
11	the remainder of this site other than the boathouse
12	footprint to remain perpetual open space.
13	And that concludes my comments, Madam
14	Chair.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
16	MS. GIORDANO: That concludes our
17	presentation. I will ask everybody, all of our
18	witnesses, to come forward at this time for questions.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
20	Who would like to start with questions?
21	Mr. Hood?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mine will probably
23	be the quickest because I am more interested in the
24	discussion. Let me just ask this. Looking at some of
25	the submittals that were entered into the regard who

1	is the Potomac Boat Club? I don't know who to even
2	direct that question to. Who is it?
3	MR. JOHNSON: The Potomac Boat Club is an
4	organization that owns a facility that is downstream
5	from our proposed facility about 150 yards or so
6	downriver.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Downriver. Okay.
8	MR. JOHNSON: It is a private boat club
9	restricted by zoning, I think, to 250-275 members.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Actually, this will
12	help. Potomac Boat Club is the white building with
13	the green trim right next to the Aqueduct Bridge. The
14	Washington Canoe Club is the green structure with
15	white trim.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
17	MR. JOHNSON: And then our proposed
18	boathouse is a this is a photograph with our
19	building superimposed on it.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is this picture in
21	front of me in succession? You have what's proposed,
22	and then you have the Washington Canoe Club. And then
23	you have the Capital Crescent.
24	MR. JOHNSON: Correct.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's exactly how

it sits?

2.0

2 MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Now I have a question. And forgive me. This is from the Park Service, Ms. Blumenthal, I believe. It's mentioned in this correspondence. It says the commission established a boating subcommittee five years ago, which has worked very hard and collegially, despite its own difference, to come to a support of a plan that blends public, private, and university uses. Who was this subcommittee made up of?

MS. BLUMENTHAL: It was made up of the university coaches from Georgetown, Tony Johnson, George Washington, high school rowers, other college rowers, and I believe some rowers that are what they call masters — they're not in a collegiate program at all, but they still row competitively — and parents who are supporters. And the Washington Canoe Club was a member of that but dropped out.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Most of the time when I see subcommittees, I think of everyone involved, community participants. That's what I was looking for there, but that obviously didn't happen at that point.

1	MS. BLUMENTHAL: If I may, the Georgetown				
2	Waterfront Commission, of which that was a				
3	subcommittee, had sort of special interest				
4	subcommittees. Those that were interested in one				
5	particular aspect focused on that. There was also a				
6	design subcommittee and some other				
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: A lot of				
8	subcommittees to				
9	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.				
LO	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: counteract the				
L1	subcommittees. Okay.				
L2	MS. BLUMENTHAL: It's Georgetown.				
L3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I'm				
L4	confused on that. Let me move to my next questions.				
L5	You've kind of answered my question I had about George				
L6	Washington. I don't know if should I even bring this				
L7	up, but I'm going to.				
L8	Even though you still say you have on the				
L9	table an agreement with George Washington and that				
20	was one of my questions, are we being also fair to the				
21	other universities in the area? You all have				
22	something similar, same type of agreement or similar				
23	agreement with George Washington?				
24	MS. BLUMENTHAL: With respect to George				
25	Washington, we're at the beginning of a long process,				

1	similar to what we have gone through with Georgetown.			
2	I think it's fair to say and perhaps, Tony, you			
3	could help me with this that George Washington is			
4	probably the only other university that has a program			
5	large enough to necessitate its own facility.			
6	There are a number of other university			
7	programs, American, Catholic, but they are small			
8	enough programs so that they will continue to have			
9	their shells in Thompson's Boat Center, which is where			
10				
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thompson's?			
12	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes. That will become a			
13	center for scholastic eights and some fours, which			
14	count high schools and the Catholic and American.			
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Mr. Johnson,			
16	you don't see opening your doors to other universities			
17	being able to come in and use your facility?			
18	MR. JOHNSON: We've been asked if in our			
19	building we would have others as a part of it, whether			
20	high school or university. We have said, a, no, that			
21	I think we want to see how the facility functions and			
22	works as our own facility in terms of rowing from it			
23	and the storage of shells.			
24	The rowing tank is an area that I see that			
25	others it will be made available to others, whether			

1 institutions or other rowing club groups. This will be the first rowing tank in the immediate 2 And I know that it will be well-received 3 D.C. area. 4 by others. And we want to share that. 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I wrote Someone mentioned that the other area, 6 this down. 7 which is the area that is being exchanged for, could 8 be built as a matter of right because it is already a And I wrote myself a note, "Why not build it 9 CM-1. 10 there, as opposed to here?" 11 MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you, Commissioner 12 Hood. I was the one who mentioned that that site is we 13 currently zoned and was zoned when 14 ownership of it, but perhaps Ms. Blumenthal can answer the question better as to why we probably shouldn't 15 16 build there. I think she spoke a little bit about 17 that as part of her testimony. 18 MS. BLUMENTHAL: We agreed that 19 zoned that they could build there as a matter 20 right, but from the perspective of the resource and 21 both properties -- let me clarify. 22 Both the property that Georgetown owns 23 upstream, which is on that big aerial photograph, -it is about as far up as Delcarlia Reservoir; that's 24

about how far up it is -- and our property are both

within the boundary of the C&O Canal National Historic Park. But we believe that the property upstream that Georgetown owns is a much more sensitive site, a much more valuable resource.

The property that we are exchanging with them is second grove. It's invasive. It's exotic plants. It's been tremendously disturbed by the construction of the sewer, the Dulles interceptor sewer. And we would rather see the development down here on the boathouse than on a less fragile site.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me go back to you, Mr. Johnson, because I also have here in your testimony, when you were testifying, I was going along with what you were saying. You were saying about the public enjoyment. That kind of led me to believe that the public was going to also be able to come in and utilize the facility, but obviously I was incorrect in my assumption.

MR. JOHNSON: The boathouse is planned and primarily, the primary user will be the university. We will have some other components, some public component. What exactly that is still -- we have been offered funds to run a summer program for the youth of Washington, D.C.

We have run camps before that were not

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

just for Washington, D.C. We have a model of a group that we think would be functional for the public good.

And we would like to investigate that. We haven't been promised any of those things.

We know we want to get into some public component, but we are also sensitive to other users of the river, other groups that are already doing some of these things. And where exactly our place is in that is still to be determined.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: Mr. Hood, if I might add, Thompson's and the boathouse that we are going to be building, I can show you better right here, between Potomac and the Key Bridge, are public facilities. The public can go in there and rent canoes, kayaks. They offer public lessons for rowing at Thompson's.

So the public need is accommodated on the Georgetown waterfront in an existing and proposed facility. Additionally, we are working as part of our own planning but as part of the Anacostia waterfront initiative to advance the public facilities on the Anacostia.

The D.C. Rec, Department of Recreation, in conjunction with something called Capitol Rowing Club has just opened a facility at the 11th Street Bridges.

We understand that Gonzaga High School wants to move, I guess physically has moved, to the Anacostia because it is more in keeping with their location but, more importantly, their social mission in the city. So the outreach to the public and to teaching rowing in the city is occurring in more than just at Georgetown boathouse.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I guess this will go to Mr. Muse, the architect, because I am very much interested in hearing further discussions. When I first looked at this, this is what I have to go by.

If I am looking at this and reading the materials, I just thought that this was just humongous. I'm going to be frankly honest. I thought that was extremely large for everything that we have been doing with the waterfront initiative here in the city.

The whole thing is the view, being able to see the waterfront. Unfortunately, I didn't have that. I think that would have helped me. And if it was here, I didn't see it.

But what I was going to ask, Madam Chair, including what we have here, but since we don't have it, I would like to see views from certain angles with this proposed building. I am not condemning it to the

2.0

_	didificed.			
2	I'm not saying anything negative about it.			
3	I just think from my perspective in looking at what I			
4	have to look at, I thought that this was huge.			
5	I have been educated this evening on			
6	rowing and rowing tanks and everything else. So maybe			
7	now I can go back. And I have more knowledge to			
8	proceed with an intelligent decision.			
9	But let me just ask, Mr. Gross, you			
10	mentioned a setback. What is the setback for			
11	Thompson's?			
12	MR. GROSS: I don't know, Mr. Hood.			
13	Perhaps Ms. Blumenthal or Mr. Johnson might know.			
14	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I don't know, but we			
15	could certainly provide it for the record if you don't			
16	know.			
17	MR. JOHNSON: It's about 40 feet.			
18	MS. BLUMENTHAL: It's deeper than this.			
19	MR. JOHNSON: Yes. It's about 40 feet			
20	from the front of the building to the edge of the			
21	ramp.			
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I will tell you			
23	this. I was glad to hear that the public will be able			
24	to go in front of your facility, but the question is			
25	that's why I want to know the setback for Thompson's			

1 is adequate and also make that public access. 2 Now let me ask you a question, Mr. 3 You mentioned about up and down, the rowing. So I don't know 4 don't row every day. 5 terminology. But you mentioned, I think, you go in one direction, you turn around, and you come back in 6 7 the other direction. 8 MR. JOHNSON: In the rowing tank, yes. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. 10 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, I'm sorry. 11 river, yes. I'm sorry. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Who's going to 13 control that? You mentioned that some people you 14 can't control. I'm one of those folks that you're not 15 going to be able to control. 16 Who is going to have jurisdiction that's 17 in front of this boathouse? Are you going to claim 18 jurisdiction or are you just going to have to say, 19 "Excuse me. We need to work around them"? How is 2.0 that going to work? 21 There are two MR. BRANGMAN: Excuse me. 22 questions there. There is a Potomac River safety 23 committee that grew out of a recognized need for better education and regulation, if you will. 24 25 all self-regulated for users on the river, primarily a

campaign of awareness and education for what the hazards of the rivers are, for us in our case, for rowers, and also what is common courtesy and safe. We all are on the lookout for the person who just happens to be out there.

The second question about the use of the commonly accepted pattern on the river has been for the canoe clue to use the water from in front of their club up behind the three sister islands. And that showed on the map that we had. And we will have to cross that path. I consider it -- again, let me pull that up.

Washington Canoe Club is the white area there, and the proposed boathouse is in the outline right there. For us to get out to the rowing lanes, we have to cross out to the long white line here. That long white line would be similar on a highway to a right-hand shoulder if you're going from right to left, as the shells do.

Shell traffic is coming upriver. And the right-hand side of that lane of traffic from the Key Bridge to the three sisters islands, your rock formation right in here, is this long line. The return and their left-hand shoulder would be the dividing line between the two paths of traffic:

1 upstream and then back downstream. Upstream they'll go on another mile or two miles, wherever a crew 2 3 chooses to turn around. For us to depart our boathouse, we would 4 5 go out beyond some designated area, hopefully agreed upon with Washington Canoe Club. And we would propose 6 7 that we mark that with a line of buoys in the water. 8 In order to do that, we have to have the 9 permission of whatever regulates all of this. I think 10 it's the Corps of Engineers. It would be simple 11 enough to do. It's a very simple thing to put in. 12 I would propose that we would teach our people to not sit out here in front of our boathouse 13 14 but just to go out beyond this line of buoys. 15 when they're ready to row, they would go on up river 16 or if they are going downriver and the similar thing 17 for coming back in. 18 my mind, it is no different 19 sharing the same road, pulling out of your driveway, 2.0 pulling out of a shopping center. You watch for 21 traffic coming one way or the other, and you proceed. I think we can learn to do that. 22 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have just two 24 quick questions. In looking here the

schematic on A-1.01, I am just wondering if you could

1	get by with something less than what I see here.
2	Again, I go back to my initial statement.
3	When I first looked at it, I thought it was just
4	entirely too large for the waterfront and everything
5	that we have been trying to do down here with the
6	waterfront initiative, like the rowing tank.
7	I don't know. Can that be scaled back
8	some? Where you have here the three boat bays, can
9	that be condensed a little more than what I see here
10	on this schematic? Could you get by with something
11	less than what you have?
12	MR. JOHNSON: The whole purpose and point
13	of building a boathouse is to build a facility that we
14	think will serve our needs for a long time to come.
15	So size and scale, the components of the
16	program is one that we thought matched best our needs
17	and expense. It's comparable to other universities
18	that are similar in ones we compete with, similar to
19	Georgetown and ones we compete with. I would hate to
20	have to cut back on that basic program.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You wanted to add
22	to it?
23	MR. BRANGMAN: Excuse me, Commissioner
24	Hood. If I might, I would answer that question a
25	little bit differently. With respect to the size of

the facility, if you'll remember, during the presentation when Mr. Muse talked about the overall size of the boat bays at the lower level and the overall size of the rowing tank at the lower level, on the boat bays, I would argue if we make those any smaller than they are, then the vessels that we have to store inside won't fit. So the size of those bays is being driven by the length of those crafts of those shells.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What about the rowing tank?

MR. BRANGMAN: On the rowing tank, I think the correct answer is yes, if we wanted to have less than 24, we could configure a tank that would be smaller. The question then that I would pose to Tony is whether or not something less meets what his coaching needs and desires are.

But if you flip to the second floor of the plan and you look at the configuration with respect to the locker rooms and the amount of space that we have to provide for the size teams that we have got, that is also dictating a particular floor plate size or size of the building, which cannot be reduced.

If we start to get into a situation there where we are starting to diminish the size of the

2.0

93				
facility or give preference to one team over the				
other, meaning men over women or women over men, then				
we also get into Title IX issues that we've got to				
deal with in terms of the size facility that we're				
providing.				
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.				
I'm looking forward, Madam Chairman, to hearing the				
further discussion. Let me just ask this final				
question, which				
MR. MUSE: Same question. Just one more				
answer about that is that one of the things about this				
boathouse is that it really has very few rooms in it.				
When you compare this with other				

When you compare this with other boathouses being made today, for example, the Princeton boathouse, where our boathouse on the second floor has the exercise room, which is that central room, at Princeton, that central room is a social hall basically. There are men's exercise rooms and women's

We have really reduced it to the fewest number of rooms. So what we are trying to do is really two things: number one, size the rooms properly but not make any more rooms than we have to.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: My last question is one that puzzles me often. When I hear all the

exercise rooms.

1 support you've got, the Georgetown Board, the ANC, and others and then I get a lot of letters of opposition, 2 3 that puzzles me. 4 I am hoping that the ANC person is here 5 because I have some questions. Well, I have on Who did the outreach to 6 particular question. 7 Was it the Park Service or was neighborhood? 8 Georgetown? Who did that? 9 MS. BLUMENTHAL: I'd say we both did. 10 MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, Commissioner Hood, on 11 any projects that Georgetown undertakes within our 12 community, we always in the community are out reviewing our projects with the various entities that 13 14 we have to present them to. So we take a very active 15 role in getting out before the community to present 16 our project. 17 Ms. Blumenthal is right. In this case, 18 the two of us went together because we recognized from 19 day one that we don't own the land yet. It is Park 2.0 That is actually part of the reason we Service land. 21 entered into the agreement so that we could 22 forward, too, with the voice of one, rather than 23 individually. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And you have the

ANC support?

1 MR. BRANGMAN: 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Recent support or 3 was it --MR. BRANGMAN: We have been to the ANC on 4 5 two occasions. I believe their vote was taken in If we have to go back again, that is not 6 2001. 7 something that we are loathe to do. We spend a lot of 8 time before the ANC for the number of projects in 9 Georgetown. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I wouldn't even 11 ask. I was just curious that -- I'm just not getting the balance here with the letters I have and what was 12 13 brought forth from the advisory neighborhood commission. 14 15 In your view of those meetings, those 16 outreach meetings that you went to and dealt with, was 17 it a lot of opposition? Was it for working together? 18 What was your view on it? 19 MR. BRANGMAN: Most of the public review 2.0 meetings that we went to, there were some questions. 21 We gave a presentation that is very similar to the 22 presentation that we gave to you this evening. 23 stated in my testimony, I think you have heard others 24 say, we received unanimous support on those where we 25 required to have a vote.

1	We spent time with the Washington Canoe
2	Club, who is probably one of the major I might say
3	detractors with respect to what we are proposing to
4	do. We spent three meetings with them. A lot of my
5	belief since you're asking me for my opinion of what
6	you are seeing now did not happen until very recently.
7	We're not sure why that is. It may be
8	more appropriate for you to ask them why they're
9	objecting this late in the game.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just say
11	this. I am going to ask them.
12	MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I just wanted to
14	get your view, as opposed to having to ask you on the
15	back end. And I probably would have forgotten it. I
16	figured I would ask you while I remembered. That's
17	why I asked that question. They will be asked of the
18	ANC also.
19	MS. GIORDANO: If I could just add also?
20	What may appear like a broad number of individuals is
21	really an orchestrated few organizations which are the
22	source of opposition.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're not going to
24	have any demonstrations. We're not going to have any
25	feedback from the gallery here. Everybody will get a

1 chance to make their own representation. MR. GROSS: If I could add --2 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just say, I asked that because I think the record 4 definitely took me for a loop because I was expecting 5 one thing, and I got something else. But we will ask 6 I will ask the appropriate people at the 7 8 appropriate time. 9 Thank you, Madam Chair. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood. 11 MR. GROSS: If I could add to that, Mr. 12 Hood? Just in the last few days, in terms of the 13 interests of rowing organizations and recreational organizations oriented to the river, in the last few 14 15 days, substantive letters in support went into the 16 record from the National Capital Area Scholastic Rowing Association, the Potomac Boat Club, the Potomac 17 18 River High School Boathouse Coalition, the Georgetown 19 Waterfront Commission, Potomac River Sports guess those are the main ones 2.0 Foundation. I 21 So even among the rowing and recreational noticed. 22 community, we have a lot of support there. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 24 Mr. May? Mr. Hannaham? 25 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: The last series of

questions, that was a concern I had, too. Obviously it will all come out because we will be hearing from other people.

I think it was Mr. Brangman. I think you mentioned during the course of this whole process of planning and review that many of the revisions that you have made actually were a result of talking to people.

I just would be interested in if you could give us some highlights as to how those kinds of interactions affected the final design that you presented to us tonight. Where did you start from? How were you affected? What kinds of things did you learn? What changes did you make?

MR. BRANGMAN: Let me first say that Muse Architects is not the first set of architects that we had on this project. We had actually hired another firm to do an initial feasibility study for us and took the plan out that they had proposed to do. We were just not convinced that that plan was doing for us what we needed to have done as an institution and also in terms of what we were looking for and for this project to be on the waterfront.

As we went through the ANC process, as we went through the old Georgetown Board process and Fine

2.0

Arts Commission process, as we spent time with the Washington Canoe Club, as we spent time with the C&O Canal Commission folks, we were taking notes during those meetings.

A lot of the final solution with respect to the separation of the trail, our service lanes with respect to the bike trail are as a result of direct conversations during those meetings or, actually, two meetings that we dealt with on them.

Some of the changes that the architects made with respect to the decisions to try and scale the building in three different pieces and start to divide that up was as a result of some of the comments that we had initially gotten from some of the Washington Canoe Club folks.

So there has been a concerted effort to make changes to the design, again, from our point of view keeping always in consideration that we had a program that we were trying to achieve; that we were trying to meet with this facility; and that given the constraints of, again, the size of the shells and what needs to go into this building, it can only be but so small.

At one point in time, I should say as well we actually had two facilities: one that took care of

2.0

primarily the storage of the shells and the locker rooms and training room above and another that was the rowing tank and some storage with it as well, which created what appeared to be too small a facility on the site, but when you added it all up, it ended up being larger than the one that we are currently proposing now.

I think it is just a matter of we get these guys to work. They come up with a scheme. We

I think it is just a matter of we get these guys to work. They come up with a scheme. We sit down. We review it. We listen to the comments. I can't say that we take all of them and make changes to the proposed plans that we have got, but we do try to accommodate those that still allow us to use the building as we would like to see it used.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Would you consider those kinds of recommendations or suggestions locally to be of more importance as up and down the East Coast to other universities that you visited, other sites that you looked at?

MR. BRANGMAN: I'm not sure I could answer that in terms of what went into some of those facilities. I would say that I think that --

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: In terms of their effect on you and the decisions you finally made with regard to design.

2.0

1 MR. BRANGMAN: Yes. We made a concerted effort to try and make this not look like some of 2 3 those. 4 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. That is 5 learning, too, learning what not to do. 6 MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, yes. 7 MR. MUSE: One more point of things that 8 we learned from other groups, this photo montage that 9 you have spoken about, it really helps to show what 10 this boathouse is about. The first drawing we showed 11 to the Washington Canoe Club was the one that, Mr. 12 Hood, you said you thought made this building look 13 awfully large. We had drawn that from 14 downriver to try to show these two buildings together. 15 Members of the Washington Canoe Club who 16 were going to meet with them requested that we have a 17 drawing from straight across the river to show the 18 entire river. 19 So it's not just making changes in terms 2.0 of requests from these groups, but it's really being 21 willing to show them whatever they would like to see 22 about this building, whatever angle they would like to 23 see it from, whatever combination of other buildings 24 in context to make sure that it's fully understood.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM:

25

Thank

Thank you.

1	you, Madam Chair.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
3	Hannaham.
4	Mr. May?
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you. I
6	will try to deal with the quick and easy questions.
7	Ms. Blumenthal, what was the GW site you
8	pointed to? I missed where that was supposed to be.
9	So that is on the other side of the Key Bridge, then?
10	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes. It's between the
11	Key Bridge and 34th Street. That's the bottom end of
12	the boathouse zone that was established in the '80s
13	through the planning process.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: That was my other
15	question. I read those reports that went way back on
16	options for boathouse locations. And I was a little
17	confused about what was still in the picture as the
18	realm of possibility. So that's the furthest
19	downriver?
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Correct.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that is
22	probably it for questions for you.
23	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The other one, actually,
24	the photo montage makes it really easy to show you
25	where the little one is where we do singles and

1	doubles and kayak.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
3	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Next to Potomac Boat
4	Club,
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Oh, I see.
6	MS. BLUMENTHAL: there are three
7	townhouses right there, privately owned townhouses.
8	We will acquire those, demolish them, and then in that
9	site between the Potomac Boat Club and Key Bridge
10	build a public facility for singles, doubles, kayaks,
11	and canoes. That will be the public facility if you
12	want to go rent a kayak or canoe.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you.
14	I guess I have questions for Mr. Johnson.
15	On the shells, you use the same ones all the time.
16	The team use the same ones. And so if you have a meet
17	that's in another location, a truck pulls up and picks
18	them up and carries them away?
19	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: How often does that
21	kind of thing happen?
22	MR. JOHNSON: We travel to three or four
23	regattas in the course of the fall. We race on six or
24	seven weekends through the spring, into March and into
25	this time of the year in mid May. And some of those

1 weekends, we're racing at home, and some squads are 2 traveling. 3 Georgetown owns two trucks, two trailers in case we have two directions we're going in. 4 5 typical would be pulling the trailer in on a Friday 6 from campus, -- it's stored up on campus in a garage, 7 will be in a garage -- bring it down, load it up, 8 drive off either Friday night or Saturday morning with 9 it. 10 We don't need to leave the trailer here 11 once it's loaded. And, in fact, it will be difficult 12 to make full use of the boathouse and have the trailer 13 on site because it is or isn't the place where the 14 trailer is going to partially block the doors or the 15 bays. 16 COMMISSIONER MAY: I imagine you're doing 17 that now in your current situation. You have a 18 similar kind of construction --19 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER MAY: -- where you can park? 20 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. 21 22 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Okay. I think 23 in your previous discussion, you explained everything 24 I needed to know about rowing tanks. And I appreciate 25 it.

1	I have a question about the lanes. I am
2	glad this drawing is up here. Are these the lanes
3	that you use now for rowing or is it different?
4	MR. JOHNSON: The long lines that go from
5	Key Bridge up towards the sisters are the ones that
6	are used now, yes. Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. But when there's
8	a regatta and there's a finish line that's down at
9	Thompson's, then there's obviously a different lane?
10	MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. On the
11	rowing course, there's a 2,000-meter rowing course on
12	the river for collegiate and club rowing. There's a
13	1,500-meter course that's used by the high schools.
14	Both of those courses for rowing involve changing the
15	normal traffic pattern on the river because you are
16	either starting on the wrong side of the river or
17	finishing on it or whatever.
18	So we do not train on a day-to-day basis
19	on the full length of our race course.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well, that
21	explains it.
22	MR. JOHNSON: That's probably more than
23	you wanted to know, too.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, no. That's
25	helpful. Can you point to me, generally speaking,
l	I and the second

what	the	course	1S?

2.0

MR. JOHNSON: First, the finish line for the 2,000-meter course is at the lower end of the boardwalk at Washington Harbor. And it is four lanes wide, and it goes right up through this second arch from Virginia. And this white line is where it starts, but in order to run the full course, it has to start up on the wrong side of the traffic pattern on a day-to-day basis and then straight on down through here to finish at Thompson's, 2000 meters from the boardwalk at Washington Harbor to the top of the three sisters.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Let's see, now. I have some architecture questions. Since it's a map amendment, I'll try to restrain myself. Otherwise I would ask a lot more questions.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It is a special exception under the W-O. So knock yourself out.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, good. Thank you.

No one has any plans for the evening, right? No.

This should be pretty simple anyway.

It is interesting to hear Commissioner Hood's reaction to the drawings that were done.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Actually, it would be kind of nice if somebody could take that one down because I had kind of the opposite reaction.

When I looked at the perspective, it seemed like because of the way we were seeing this prospective drawing, that we were seeing more of the compatible elements.

I mean, there's clearly a difference in the size, but it's a very deliberate effort to make the wings match up with the Washington Canoe Club. But then when I saw that one there, it looks like when the photo montage was done, that somebody took the image of the building you are proposing and sort of inflated it by about 20 percent because it looks just about 20 percent bigger than the rest of the context.

Now, that's almost an aside because the real question for me has to do with the building heights overall. And the question of this statement, I guess, is can you run through again what the heights were of the building because I remember hearing 50 and 40 and 30? I would just like to know exactly what those were.

MR. MUSE: Well, first of all, to talk about the two drawings, we had made this drawing originally because in coming at it from an angle like

1 this, it does show the depth of the wings, the fact that the two side wings are pushed back. 2 We believed originally that showing that 3 4 three-dimensional quality of this building was very 5 important. And, as I said a couple of seconds ago, it was only when the Washington Canoe Club requested a 6 7 is really an elevation and directly drawing that 8 across the river, which flattens this building out. So I think you have to look at both of those together. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure. 11 MR. MUSE: The heights of the buildings, 12 the main pavilion in the middle to the ridge of the 13 roof, the very top is 54 feet. To the ridge of the 14 wings, it's 41 feet. And then we step down again to the ridge of the entry, and that's 32 feet. 15 16 Bill, you might pick up the entry facade 17 again, not only because drawing. Once 18 Washington Canoe Club but because of how you will 19 approach this building by land, this is what you see 20 when you arrive by land. 21 This is how the building is stepping down from 54 feet all the way back to 41 feet to 32 feet to 22 23 step that scale down and put what really appears to be

We have also talked about landscaping the

an enclosed porch on this end facade.

24

area between this building and the Washington Canoe Club to make something that is in scale with how you approach along that walkway.

It is fairly consistent in the way the waterfront buildings are made, that you have a different scale from land than you do from water. So then as we go out to the water, that's when we see the larger scale of this building because you see it from all the way across the river.

Once again, I would ask that you pair up those two drawings to realize that the wings are quite far back from that main projecting body.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Now, let me say that, first of all, I don't feel too concerned about it because I think it is a very handsome building. I understand pretty thoroughly the difficulty of trying to combine this particular style with the space requirements that you have because it will grow the apparent mass of the building quite substantially.

And I think you have done a very good job of trying to scale all of that back and poke enough holes in it in the process with the porches and the other elements to make it have a more personal scale and relate better on all sides. I think it is, as I said, a very handsome building.

2.0

1	I guess my question about heights goes
2	more to the technical side of height measurement,
3	though. So I guess I have to ask the first question.
4	When we have a building that is subject to a 40-foot
5	height limit, we have to measure the height from the
6	front of the building, which is where? Is it on the
7	river?
8	MR. MUSE: Would you point to the drawings
9	and clarify that?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you. So that's
11	what I would have expected, but, then again, the front
12	of the Capitol is not what most people think it is.
13	So I had to ask directly.
14	Theoretically from the front, from the
15	measuring point in the middle of that front elevation,
16	somewhere along the line, whatever the average is, to
17	the ceiling of the uppermost finished floor is how
18	much?
19	MR. MUSE: That is 40 feet.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's exactly 40 feet?
21	Okay. Does that account for the way the grade drops
22	off there at the front in the natural grade? I don't
23	think we can measure from the finished grade or is
24	that right?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

Well, this is tricky

_	because there's no street. I think it is the imished
2	grade at the middle of the front.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the finished
4	grade, once they finished the grade?
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Somebody can
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. Well, I
7	would like to see that in the drawing somewhere
8	because I tried to figure it out from what I had. And
9	I couldn't see any heights of the ceiling there.
LO	It was just a little confusing for me to
L1	talk about a 54-foot ridge. And I had to understand
L2	exactly how much we lose in that due to the fact that
L3	it's a gable roof.
L4	I guess, believe it or not, that's
L5	actually it for my architectural questions. I do have
L6	one other question that goes to the use. Maybe this
L7	is an architectural question. I don't know.
L8	The exercise room, what exercise is
L9	actually going to occur there? And what kind of stuff
20	is going to be in that space? It's not the weight
21	room or anything like that because
22	MR. JOHNSON: The rowing machines,
23	ergometers are the primary
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: What?
25	MR. JOHNSON: A rowing machine, an
l	

1 individual rowing machine. There is one very popular common manufacturer of a rowing machine, which is 2 3 called an ergometer. 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. 5 MR. JOHNSON: They are seven feet long and help teach people what -- it has a monitor on it. 6 7 you get instant feedback, what they're doing, how much 8 they're doing relative to one another, relative to 9 their performance the day before, the year before, 10 whatever. 11 COMMISSIONER MAY: I have to ask this 12 question because I know I saw a reference to other 13 uses or other events within the space. And I'm 14 thinking particularly about the exercise room. 15 I presume that what you're proposing or what would occur in the exercise room rules out pretty 16 much that anybody is going to sort of push the stuff 17 18 to the side and have some kind of reception there 19 because you're not proposing any kind of use that's 20 not related specifically to rowing, right? The primary purpose is a 21 MR. JOHNSON: 22 training area, training facility. And in the plan, 23 there is a smaller club room, if you will, on the front corner. Maybe at some point in the future, that 24

will be converted into a second office.

1	If you had a small group of alumni,
2	parents after an event, after a race, they might spill
3	out onto the balconies. We'll primarily use that
4	area.
5	The rowing machines can be moved, and the
6	area could be used. We don't plan, we don't envision
7	that happening when we are in our primary function
8	time of training. It defeats the purpose if we help
9	parties there, for example, because it defeats the
10	whole purpose and the reason we're raising the money
11	we are and wanting to have the facility for what we
12	want to have it for.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: And the development
14	office has seen the plans, right?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So it's within
17	the realm of possibility, but it's really not. It
18	would be problematic for a regular use as an event
19	hall. Okay.
20	I think that's it for me. Thanks.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. May.
22	I want to talk a little bit more about the
23	parking. In talking about why it's appropriate to
24	waive the on-site parking requirement, there is a case
25	made for the fact that the routine use of the facility

1	will be by students and those students are coming by
2	walking or cycling.
3	Then Coach Johnson talked about use of the
4	rowing tank by other groups, which, then, they're
5	obviously not going to be coming from Georgetown.
6	They're going to be coming from elsewhere.
7	So that introduces a component into the
8	parking management that really isn't dealt with by
9	people. You can't rely on people coming, walking, and
10	cycling. So what do you propose to do about that?
11	MR. JOHNSON: The closest access point
12	would be still to be determined by the Park Service
13	and the bike trail but basically at the Aqueduct
14	Bridge.
15	Right now you could drive up to the fence
16	on Washington Canoe Club. There's hardly any room to
17	turn around. But presumably the access will be cut
18	off at Aqueduct Bridge. And so a user, if they came
19	by bus or car or foot or whatever would be parking
20	back on Water Street, which ends at Aqueduct Bridge.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I guess I need
22	to know more about the number of people that might be
23	coming. This you may need to think more about and
24	just make an additional submission. How many people

might be coming to use the rowing tank? That is going

	to be a certain volume of cars, and they are going to
2	need to be dealt with.
3	I am a fairly frequent user of the Capital
4	Crescent Trail. And unless it's quite early in the
5	morning, there's not an abundance of available parking
6	down there. So I just ask you to give that some
7	further consideration.
8	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Madam Chair, can I help
9	with this, please?
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure.
11	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The long-range plan for
12	the park would be that at a certain point in time,
13	when it's developed and when we're the property owner
14	on both sides except for the Potomac Boat Club, which
15	is staying, calls for a Thompson's Boat Center parking
16	lot kind of configuration underneath Key Bridge of
17	about 100 spaces. You know how the Thompson's Boat
18	Center is?
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: So we will reconfigure
21	the end of K Street to provide parking for those
22	people who want to go up to use the rowing machines
23	or, in other words, at a certain point in time, cars
24	will no longer be permitted other than emergency
25	vehicles to go all the way up to where they go now.

_	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 50 CHey essencially
2	won't have access past the Aqueduct Bridge?
3	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Somewhere in there. We
4	have to work with the District because it involves K
5	Street, but at some point in time, there will be a
6	turnaround, and cars will no longer go there. And we
7	will be providing metered parking, like we have at
8	Thompson's.
9	The other issue that affects why
10	Georgetown needs a waiver is our land exchange
11	agreement, which turns into perpetual covenants
12	running with the land, precludes parking on their
13	site.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand that
15	part.
16	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm just saying there
18	needs to be some kind of a plan.
19	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Of how they would get
20	people there?
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. And there
22	needs to be a plan appending the parking lot if the
23	ultimate plan is to have these people park.
24	Since you mention that there is going to
25	be some reconfiguration of the end of K Street, I

1	would be interested in having, even if it's just
2	preliminarily, some kind of understanding about what
3	that is going to look like because I also have a
4	concern and I was a little bit distressed that we
5	haven't had any feedback from the Department of
6	Transportation yet about the proposal to shuttle buses
7	with team folks or whatever that are going to be
8	competing on the site and turning around at the base
9	of K Street because that is a fairly chaotic little
10	tangle of cars right now.
11	So I would be interested in knowing what
12	that is eventually planned to look like and how buses
13	will be turning around in that area given that still
14	that is the access point to the Capital Crescent
15	Trail. So any feedback that you all could give on
16	that point I would appreciate.
17	Also, in terms of controlling access to
18	the site, vehicular access to the site, I don't know.
19	I think, Coach Johnson, you mentioned that there
20	might be a fence or a gate at some point?
21	MR. JOHNSON: Yes, yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The Washington Canoe
23	Club has a fence, right, if I remember correctly?
24	MR. JOHNSON: Well, what has been proposed
25	by the C&O Canal part of the National Park Service

1	it is only a proposal at this point is to have an
2	under Aqueduct Bridge, somewhere around Aqueduct
3	Bridge bollards that are fixed that would
4	allow bicyclists and hikers and so on through to use
5	the trail and then some sort of a gate that the
6	Washington Canoe Club and Georgetown would have a key
7	card for to access to our facilities.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would just be at
9	a certain point so that vehicles couldn't pass, but
10	there wouldn't be any kind of fencing around the
11	facility itself?
12	MR. JOHNSON: Not around our facility, no.
13	No. And this would be back somewhere around the
14	Aqueduct Bridge is what we have been what the C&O
15	Canal, park people suggested.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anything that you can
17	do to explain that better to us so that we would
18	understand what the configuration might look like in
19	the future would be helpful. The case where there
20	would be regatta and you had mentioned that there
21	would be that the finish line is down at Thompson's
22	
23	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But all the team
25	folks have been shuttled up to the Georgetown

1	boathouse. And they leave all their things there.
2	And they put their boats in the water. And then they
3	race to Thompson's. Then they come back.
4	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How does that get
6	accomplished?
7	MR. JOHNSON: If we have a regatta that
8	Georgetown hosts, it's a small regatta that involves
9	one or two visiting schools. One school, we would be
10	able to entertain them, you know, have them unload
11	their shells at our facility, launch from there, go
12	race, come back, load their shells up, and go from
13	there.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. It's the coming
15	back part. How do they get back?
16	MR. JOHNSON: They just row. They row
17	their shells.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, they row it back?
19	Okay.
20	MR. JOHNSON: They row it back up.
21	Absolutely. They row it back up.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I didn't know if they
23	were like, "Okay. We're done. We've got it."
24	MR. JOHNSON: They got out at the end? If
25	there's a larger regatta that we are involved with, we

1	can't accommodate everybody from this facility. It
2	wouldn't be enough room. And so we would have to, as
3	we do now, use Thompson's Boat Center there, get a
4	permit from the Park Service and make arrangements to
5	use that.
6	The spectators, the people watching an
7	event, it's simple because, as has been explained,
8	they aren't going to be watching from the early part
9	of a race.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. I understand
11	that part.
12	We have in the applicant's submission from
13	November of 2002 some information about the capacity
14	of Thompson's. Although we know the sizes of the boat
15	bays and so forth, it would be helpful to me if you
16	could translate that into boats because then I could
17	compare it with Thompson's.
18	MR. JOHNSON: Comparing our size?
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What you have
20	proposed, what is the capacity in terms of boats or
21	shells or whatever they're called?
22	MR. JOHNSON: Shells. Our eight-oared
23	shells would be stored in the three bays where they
24	are perpendicular to the river. There are three bays.
25	There would be the ability to keep 30 eights in those

1	three bays.
2	The bays in the wing to the left, which
3	would be used for small boats, would be a mixture of
4	four-oared shells, two and one-person. And I would
5	just venture very quickly that might be ten fours,
6	perhaps as many pairs, two-man shells, and some number
7	of single and recreational users teaching, to teach
8	people to row in a one-person boat.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And when you
10	said "30 eights," that's per bay or all together?
11	MR. JOHNSON: No, no. Total. That's the
12	total for those three bays.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
14	MR. JOHNSON: Entering a bay, that's five
15	on one side, five on the other, ten times three.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
17	MR. JOHNSON: Five shells high on the side
18	is higher than is normally used in a boathouse and
19	accessed on a daily basis. In other words, some of
20	those upper shells might be stored and you shift them
21	around.
22	But it is higher than is normally used.
23	At Thompson's, we are all using five shells high. And
24	you have to use ladders to get them down, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

It's not convenient

1	for regular use?
2	MR. JOHNSON: It's not convenient, but it
3	can be done, yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Several places
5	where there were responses given to concerns about the
6	dimensions of the dock and we really haven't talked
7	about the dock and the projection into the water.
8	In one of these places, but I think I saw
9	it one or two different places, I think this was a
10	letter from the Park Service to perhaps the Washingtor
11	Canoe Club or something, where the statement was made
12	that the university has little ability to control the
13	dimension of the dock, but there is no explanation of
14	that.
15	So could you explain to us what dictates
16	the dimension of the dock and why that can't be
17	altered?
18	MR. JOHNSON: One, there is an apron. If
19	I could use three definitions, we will call one ar
20	apron, which is basically the same horizontal level as
21	the boat bays themselves. You walk out from the boat
22	bays right out onto an apron, and you're not dropping
23	down. That comes out 45 feet. And there is a reason
24	for that.

And then from the edge of

25

the apron

closest to the water, which is at that point actually out over the water, there is a ramp, which is this next section, that is sloped down to the dock. And so we have the three pieces: the apron, the ramp, and the dock.

The apron is 45 feet in the wintertime, because of the -- not that it happens every year, but because the river might freeze and the ice if it freezes and it's thick enough and it moves, it could tear everything out. We have to remove the dock. All of the users along the Potomac River do this.

So in the winter, we take our ramps, and we either put them on the dock or we put them somewhere, probably on the dock. And we float the dock to somewhere where it is secure and safe out of the river, the current because of the eventuality that the river might freeze and the ice would be very thick. When it goes, if it goes suddenly, everything goes with it.

If in that situation that the docks are gone and we have a flood in the winter, as we did in January of '96, and we have to remove shells from the boathouse, we have to figure out how we are going to get them out of this building.

There are doors on the back side, but the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

1 steep embankment behind us doesn't allow us to get a 60-foot shell out the back. You run into the bank and 2 3 trees and everything else. 4 We have to come out the front. 5 we're coming out the front, we have to walk We have to have something. 6 something. So that 7 feet allows us to get a 60-foot shell out and turn 8 without having the ramp or the dock there and turn it 9 and carry it around to the side, where we put it on a 10 trailer and drive it elsewhere. 11 So the ramp at 45 feet, could it be 42 12 feet or 43? Perhaps, but 45 for a 60-foot shell to 13 maneuver it, we thought was good. And then the ramp 14 itself, because it's tidal, we have to allow for a low 15 tide, high tide, and being able to walk down that ramp 16 and not have it too steep. I don't know that that 17 dimension is, but that's a fixed engineering figure. 18 And then the width of the dock is just to operate off 19 of. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And the width of the 21 dock what? I'm sorry? MR. JOHNSON: That width of the dock is 20 22 23 feet. I'm not sure of that. We could get that for 24 you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

And how about the

1	length of the dock?
2	MR. JOHNSON: The length of the dock, 240.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What dictates that
4	dimension?
5	MR. JOHNSON: When we launch shells, we
6	launch them all off the face of the dock towards the
7	river. We store our coach boats, our launches that
8	we're going to coach from. We can't keep them on the
9	front of the dock because that's where the shells go.
10	And so we keep them on the back side or
11	the end but preferably not the end for a clearance
12	reason for oars and shells. We keep them on the back
13	side.
14	And the length of those launches, we first
15	looked at a dock that was 180 feet. A 180-foot dock
16	allows 3 shells to be put in the water at the same
17	time coming or going. To add some length that's not
18	in 60-foot dimension, we could, but when we looked at
19	180, we did not have enough room behind to store the
20	launches. And so we went to 240.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
22	MR. JOHNSON: I would add
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I knew there was a
24	reason. I just didn't know what it was.
25	MR. JOHNSON: I would add one other thing.

At Thompson's Boat Center, where there are many institutional, club and institutional, users, we have launches that are tied and stored so closely together that they are continually beat up and fiberglass and aluminum boats. We look forward to a time with our own boathouse that we could get a more fragile but pontoon boat that would not throw a weight.

One of the problems that we have on the river, in addition to all of the shell traffic, is managing the weights that the coaches throw up on the other shells. So we look forward to being able to have a weightless launch, which is a more fragile launch, but we would have the space to do that here. We don't have the space to do it at Thompson's.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

Okay. What I would like to do now before we go to cross-examination is take a break for about five minutes. And during that time, we will make an assessment of how far we think we can get this evening since we're obviously not going to get done tonight to hear from everybody.

And we'll figure out when we might continue this so that those of you who don't want to stay for the rest of the hearing tonight if it doesn't look like we're going to get to certain aspects of the

2.0

1	testimony, you can be on your way and know when we
2	will be continuing.
3	So we will take a break for about five
4	minutes. Thank you.
5	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
6	the record at 9:23 p.m. and went back on
7	the record at 9:40 p.m.)
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Realistically and
9	optimistically, what we will get through this evening
10	is the cross-examination of the applicant's witnesses
11	and then the report of the Office of Planning and the
12	cross-examination of the Office of Planning.
13	So this evening we will not get to the
14	parties and persons in support and parties and persons
15	in opposition, but I need to consult with the parties
16	about their availability for a subsequent session.
17	Mr. Bastida, what are you suggesting in
18	terms of a continuation date?
19	SECRETARY BASTIDA: I would suggest, Madam
20	Chairman, Thursday, June 5, which is two weeks from
21	today. We have a hearing this coming Thursday of next
22	week. And that's when I'm suggesting that.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Ms. Giordano,
24	your witnesses, can they all be back on the 5th?
25	Okay. Dr. Schuette, how are you fixed for the 5th?

	And if you need to give me an extensive answer, you
2	need to come and get on the mike. Otherwise
3	DR. SCHUETTE: I'm at your convenience,
4	but from the back of the room, people are telling me
5	that that's when the junior trials are and would not
6	be available.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that a rowing
8	thing?
9	DR. SCHUETTE: Canoeing. Same idea.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
11	DR. SCHUETTE: But can I
12	(Laughter.)
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't know. Well,
14	we want to be sensitive to that.
15	DR. SCHUETTE: If you'd give me just one
16	second? If you want to poll the other parties, let me
17	continue the discussion in the back.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I will do
19	that. Let me find my list.
20	And somebody forgot that they were
21	supposed to turn their cell phone off.
22	Mr. Mopsik?
23	MR. MOPSIK: As far as I know. I'll have
24	to check.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Brooks?

1 I'm sorry. You missed my little intro there. determining a date for continuing the hearing beyond 2 3 whatever we think we can get done tonight. And I was asking whether or not you would be available on the 4 5 5th of June, which is a Thursday. I would also add that if you find that you 6 7 are not available for the continuation date, your 8 group can always designate someone else to testify. 9 MR. BROOKS: I will be available. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You will? Okay. 11 So it will be the 5th of June that will be the Great. 12 continuation date at 6:30 p.m. in this room. And that 13 is when we will take the testimony from persons in 14 support and parties and persons in opposition. 15 everyone is more than welcome to stay through the rest 16 of the hearing tonight. 17 So we will now go to cross-examination. 18 The ANC will be given the first opportunity to do 19 cross-examination. Mr. Starrels, did you have any 2.0 cross-examination of the applicant's witnesses? 21 Then, Dr. Schuette, you're next. 22 They won't bite. 23 DR. SCHUETTE: How do I do this? Am I allowed to ask the various members as 24 they

through their presentations?

Τ.	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can either direct
2	the questions yourself or if you don't know who is
3	best suited to answer, Ms. Giordano is usually very
4	helpful in assisting whoever might be asking questions
5	in directing the correct person to answer.
6	All I ask is that you refrain from
7	testifying at this point and you're just asking
8	questions of the applicant's witnesses on the
9	testimony, either their oral testimony or what was
10	submitted in writing.
11	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes, ma'am. I guess this
12	would go to the architects. What drawings were shown
13	the ANC, the OGB, and the CFA? I have a list from the
14	Old Georgetown Act, from their Web site. And it has a
15	very extensive list. I am sure you guys have seen
16	that. It would be sufficient if you just told me that
17	list.
18	MR. MUSE: The drawings that they were
19	shown are the same drawings that were shown tonight
20	with the exclusion of the photo montage.
21	DR. SCHUETTE: So there was no photo
22	montage. If I might have that? That's the only copy
23	I have. So they have a site plan indicating footprint
24	of adjacent or neighboring structures, significant
25	fence lines, structures?

1	MR. MUSE: Yes.
2	DR. SCHUETTE: Where did the footprint of
3	WCC come from?
4	MR. BRANGMAN: It came from both survey
5	information that we have from surveyors whom we hired
6	to go to the site and get information. It also came
7	from siting measurements at one point in time through
8	the fence since we couldn't get access to the
9	facility.
10	And then it also came as a result of
11	finalizing some of those dimensions from a meeting
12	that actually took place on site, on your site, and I
13	believe through a meeting that may have been arranged
14	through you with our project manager, Chris Jordan,
15	and our surveyors.
16	DR. SCHUETTE: And was the C&O Canal on
17	the drawings that were submitted? And was the Canal
18	Road on the drawings that were submitted?
19	MR. BRANGMAN: The C&O Canal is on the
20	drawings that are submitted. Excuse me. The towpath
21	is on the drawings that were submitted. Canal Road is
22	not, no. And the canal is not, but it is up to the
23	towpath.
24	DR. SCHUETTE: If I might, may I borrow?
25	With your permission, I would like to show the side

1	view.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Dr. Schuette, I just
3	want to make sure that you are going to ask a
4	question.
5	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes, I am.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
7	DR. SCHUETTE: What I'm looking for is the
8	side view of the facility. And since they're not my
9	drawings, this is risky. Here we go.
10	Was this drawing shown to the ANC and to
11	the CFA and
12	MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, it was.
13	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And just for the
15	record, I just wanted to note that that is the east
16	elevation? Yes. That was the east elevation.
17	DR. SCHUETTE: What does approval of the
18	Army Corps of Engineers mean? You mentioned, I
19	believe it was Bill mentioned, you mentioned that you
20	had approval from the Army Corps of Engineers.
21	MR. KIRWAN: We stated we had preliminary
22	approval after showing them our concept. Approval
23	will come after we make a final submission to them
24	once this property has zoned.

DR. SCHUETTE: So you haven't submitted an

	application yet:
2	MR. KIRWAN: No. We have only had initial
3	consultations with the Army Corps.
4	DR. SCHUETTE: He had a different opinion
5	on where we were versus what has been reported, and I
6	was just trying to figure out what that meant.
7	Tony, how many eights and quads does GU
8	currently own?
9	MR. JOHNSON: It's about 20 eight-oared
10	shells. And I the process is you buy a shell and
11	you use it for X number of years, and then you sell
12	it. And there's some in between there. We have 15
13	eights stored at Thompson's. We have three stored
14	down in Anacostia. We have one on the trailer. I
15	guess that's 19. Fours and quads, we have seven.
16	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay. And in '95, you had
17	17 eights, 6 quads, 8 pairs, and 5 singles. I'm
18	assuming that you probably have about 8 pairs and 5
19	singles right now.
20	MR. JOHNSON: You went through that list
21	too fast for me to make sure.
22	DR. SCHUETTE: In '95, you said you had 17
23	eights, 6 quads, 8 pairs, and 5 singles. And that's,
24	you know, plus/minus.
25	MR. JOHNSON: Right. The pairs, pair,

1	doubles, and singles is essentially the same now.
2	DR. SCHUETTE: In December, you told us
3	that you had 16 eights. Have you guys really acquired
4	three more eights since December?
5	MR. JOHNSON: Well, I'm not sure what
6	how the nature of the question was. At Thompson's
7	Boat Center and if I misinformed you, I'm sorry.
8	At Thompson's Boat Center, we have 15 eights that we
9	can use on a daily basis.
10	We had two more racks down there that we
11	could store shells on, but they could not they were
12	storage racks.
13	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay.
14	MR. JOHNSON: And on those two racks, we
15	stored three shells. And so that's the 18. And we've
16	acquired two since then and sold one.
17	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay. You told us in
18	December that you were planning on eventually having
19	24 eights. Do you still stand by that number?
20	MS. GIORDANO: To interrupt, I think the
21	cross-examination needs to be on his testimony. I
22	think we're on the third conversation that took place
23	a couple of years ago or something.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Dr. Schuette, where
25	are you going with this?
	1

1	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay. Where I'm going with
2	this is in the size and what you care about, the size
3	and height of this building. I don't want to state my
4	testimony right now, but an eight is 58 feet long max,
5	plus/minus.
6	The problem that is being held with the
7	docks because of the ramp, the push back onto the
8	Capital Crescent Trail, and with the special exception
9	or excuse me the variance of the 15 feet versus
10	25 feet or 100 feet all have to do with the 80-foot
11	center section of the building.
12	An eight is only 58 feet long. There is
13	no reason to house a boat unless they're going to come
14	up with some new class of rowing shell to fit in an
15	80-foot building.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
17	DR. SCHUETTE: And it doesn't make sense
18	when you're adding singles and pairs
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Why don't we cut to
20	the chase? We'll just ask the architect why given the
21	length of an eight, do you have to have the size of
22	the center section be as deep as it is? How's that,
23	whoever is going to respond?
24	MR. JOHNSON: First of all, there are
25	eight-oared shells that are 56 feet, and they are out

Τ	to 60 feet long.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What size are yours?
3	MR. JOHNSON: A mixture.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
5	MR. JOHNSON: The shells built for the
6	bigger people are a little longer these days. At each
7	end of the bay, one, you have to have access for
8	safety purposes, just movement of people. We also
9	will have shell storage at the front end.
10	Until we're actually one of the
11	problems with this facility is, as Stephen Muse has
12	pointed out to me, you always have things to store the
13	extra riggers, the oars, where do the life preservers
14	go, you know, all of these things.
15	And the bays at Thompson's varied 70-plus
16	feet. And they are tight at the ends for the access
17	around the shells given all of the other storage that
18	is there.
19	We would invite you to come down and view
20	at Thompson's what happens and how people move and how
21	that all works.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're going to have
23	to put that into the record because we can't
24	individually go down and take a look. So if you
25	wanted to provide some photographs or some drawings

1	that would illustrate what that looks like and how
2	that works at whatever dimension it is, that could
3	help.
4	Okay. Back to you, Dr. Schuette.
5	DR. SCHUETTE: My garage has the same
6	problem. I have a four-car garage that fits two cars
7	because I have so much junk.
8	You talked about a 14-foot ceiling height
9	to the first floor. And that was to hold a rowing oar
10	vertically?
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you say that
12	into a microphone so we get it on the record?
13	MR. MUSE: That plus the storage of the
14	shells, yes.
15	DR. SCHUETTE: Okay. So we are going to
16	have shells not only going to 12 feet, like Tony
17	proposed, then, but to 14 feet. So we can actually
18	put seven shells vertically?
19	MR. JOHNSON: I'm not sure. It is cheaper
20	to build space up than it is to build more bays. In
21	trying to build for the future, we knew that we wanted
22	to have space to store shells that we do not race in.
23	One of the if you want me to explain it
24	all, there are shells made that cost between 14-15
25	thousand dollars and 25 or a lot more if you choose to

do that.

2.0

The ones that are less expensive are perfectly adequate for most training, teaching purposes. The ones that are more expensive are a little lighter, a little stiffer, a little more fragile, what I refer to as ding-resistant.

If you row in the Potomac River and you have a lot of debris in it, as we do right now, it's a little bit more dangerous for our very expensive shells.

So we want -- we would like to be able to have some of each of these, to have a racing shell that we didn't have to use except at prime racing time and we can put it on a rack and not use it.

Currently for our six, eight squads, we have three shells that we can do that with now. And then we have a number of shells that are less expensive to buy, less to maintain, and certainly suitable for most of the training. It's a matter of mixing these.

We're more confined in what we can do with that at Thompson's. We look forward to having more space so that we can have a better mix of those kinds of shells.

In addition, we're building a boathouse

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

139 today for what we see as the needs and the demands today, but we realize that we're building a boathouse hopefully for 100 years or some long-term period of And we would like to know that we are going to be answering the needs of the program in the university for years to come. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. DR. SCHUETTE: Thank you very much, Tony. That works out to 36 eights. You currently have 19. Thirty-six eights. That's 300 students on the water

simultaneously.

MR. JOHNSON: A number of those shells will be stored in racks that can't be accessed and can't be used on a daily basis. They're like putting things in your attic. And you're going to have to get it down, put the riggers on, and use it. They will not be used on a daily basis.

Currently we have those 15 eights that take more than 15 crews out per day. All of those shells, you know, if you have a shell for training in the fall and you use a different shell for racing in the spring, you're not putting people in them at the same time.

DR. SCHUETTE: I think we can move on from this. You talked about the traffic pattern for the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

_	crews. I ill wondering, now does a rowing shell get to
2	the rowing lane?
3	And I think you actually did answer that,
4	although you showed a very steep angle, wouldn't you
5	agree, for a shell coming off the dock? You're
6	probably going to go upstream 200 meters in order to
7	get out to the rowing lane? You're not tied in?
8	You're going against current?
9	MR. JOHNSON: Maybe it is 200 meters. It
10	might be less to go out across to the rowing lanes.
11	DR. SCHUETTE: And once you get to the
12	rowing lane, do you then plan on sitting in the rowing
13	lane to then tie in?
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm going to just
15	ask, what does "tie in" mean?
16	DR. SCHUETTE: They have to tie their feet
17	in, a lot like Ben-Hur. You know, they tie their feet
18	into the shoes into the shell to prepare to row. And
19	so prior to
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: They don't do that
21	when they leave?
22	DR. SCHUETTE: I've seen them doing it in
23	the water. So I'm assuming that they do it in the
24	water. Tony can show us.
25	MR. JOHNSON: If you have a dock situation

141
where you are not making other people wait to either
get off the dock or land, then you sit at the dock.
And you might lace your feet in. The rowers get into
a shell in their bare feet or with socks on. And
there are shoes in the boat or a clog in the boat that
they slip their feet in.
If a shell has been used by a different
crew, there's an adjustment in it for shorter and

taller people. So all of that tieing in is a term used for how they adjust and get set to actually go row.

The distance from the dock out to this dotted line, which we referred to as a buoy line, the idea of the buoy line would be to have people be able to leave our dock and not sit in the way of canoers Washington Club should they Canoe practicing and training at the same time that we are there.

The buoy line, as we showed it here, is between a race course for Washington Canoe Club and traffic the right-hand shoulder lane for going It will all work. upstream.

DR. SCHUETTE: So you're going to then tie in in the rowing lane is what you just told me?

> MR. JOHNSON: No. They could be just the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

_	Other side of the buoy fine and not be in the rowing
2	lanes.
3	DR. SCHUETTE: I wonder if the other
4	rowers know that you're planning on tieing up out
5	there.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Hey, we're just not
7	going to allow any kind of demonstrations or calling
8	out. And if you do it again, I'm going to have to ask
9	you to leave.
10	DR. SCHUETTE: One of my best friends is a
11	rower. She managed to hit
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Are you going to ask
13	a question?
14	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes, I am.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
16	DR. SCHUETTE: The next question is
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can tell us
18	whatever you want to tell us when it is your turn to
19	testify.
20	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes. Tony, I think I read
21	on the National Park Service Web site an excellent
22	document that said that rowing oars are 12 and a half
23	feet long, this document, actually. What length oars
24	do you use? What oars are 14 feet long?
25	MR. JOHNSON: Three hundred and
- 1	

1	seventy-six centimeters. How is that? Twelve-foot,
2	four. Oars had changed in dimension in the time that
3	I have been coaching from 12-8, 12-9. They are now a
4	little shorter, and they are from 12-1 to 12-4.
5	The height of the ceiling is partially
6	dictated by being out of the floodplain, by allowing
7	us to store shells and to have the room for all of
8	those things that get up into ceilings, whether they
9	be the sewer pipe from up above or whatever. You
10	would have to I guess I would defer to the others
11	here.
12	DR. SCHUETTE: The reason I ask that
13	question is that someone testified that they needed 14
14	foot of first floor height to accommodate the oars
15	because clearly it's a single unit.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
17	DR. SCHUETTE: But now we're told that
18	oars are 12 feet, two-tenths. That's roughly a
19	two-foot difference. And I just wanted to get that on
20	the record.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And Mr. Muse is going
22	to respond to that.
23	MR. MUSE: That's one of the reasons we
24	said we had the height. Plus, you have to imagine
25	that you don't wedge this oar in between the floor and

1	the ceiling.
2	(Applause.)
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
4	MR. MUSE: The oars
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I am not going to
6	allow any more demonstrations. And if people insist
7	on it, I will just clear this room, and we will carry
8	on this hearing with just the parties and the
9	applicant's witnesses. I just find this intolerable.
10	So please don't do that.
11	DR. SCHUETTE: I'm just trying to
12	understand.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not your fault,
14	Dr. Schuette.
15	MR. MUSE: We saw many boathouses where by
16	missing things by a couple of inches in those
17	dimensions, it made areas just not useable.
18	These oars sit up in racks. You have to
19	lift them up, take them out of the rack. You need a
20	little bit of space to do that in.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
22	DR. SCHUETTE: Thank you.
23	How many boats fit on your 40-foot
24	trailer?
25	MR. JOHNSON: Nine eights, three fours, or

1	some other mixture.
2	DR. SCHUETTE: Thank you.
3	I'm new to this.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Take your time.
5	(Pause.)
6	DR. SCHUETTE: What is the overall height
7	of the building to the water?
8	MR. JOHNSON: The grade, first floor
9	grade, is nine feet. And that's from zero being
LO	what's zero? Sea level?
11	DR. SCHUETTE: Sea level at where? Ocean
12	City? Okay. I would assume that it's tidal. So that
13	must be some mean tidal level or something, but okay.
L4	Sixty-three feet.
15	What about the American Disabilities Act?
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: There was no
17	testimony about ADA.
18	DR. SCHUETTE: Well, okay. But there was
L9	testimony about no parking. And I was very intrigued.
20	And I wanted to ask, where do the maintenance crews
21	park? Where does the janitor park? Where does the
22	cleaning lady park? Where does the plumber, the HVAC
23	guy? Where does security park? Where do the caterers
24	park?
25	I know in the District I just got a ticket

1 because I got out of my car and walked 50 feet that parking means you left your vehicle. 2 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How will the parking 4 plan accommodate people who will be servicing the 5 building in some way? MR. BRANGMAN: If there is a service need 6 7 for the building, as we had talked about having the service access road, which would be different from the 8 9 bike trail, there is an area at the western end of the 10 which is also the emergency turnaround 11 space, which could also serve as a service parking 12 area while the building was being serviced. It is not our intention to have down there 13 14 on any permanent basis. And I think parking 15 short-term service, as with any facility, as is the 16 case on our campus as well, you provide for those when you need the service. And when the service is 17 18 completed, they go away. 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then regular 2.0 staff people who would be cleaning or some kind of 21 security or whatever? MR. BRANGMAN: Regular staff people who 22 23 cleaning, sitting right here, would be and 24 Security, we have security officers on students. 25 If there is a need for them to go down and campus.

patrol this area as well, that's something that we haven't discussed with them, but that certainly is something that we would have to take into consideration.

I think we also have to remember that -you know, Tony has talked about the fact that there
are going to be bollards, which are at the eastern end
or eastern terminus of the bike trail, which we will
have access cards to be able to get into and out of.
But there is not going to be traffic that is going up
this service road on any type of regular basis. It
will be controlled access. And we will control that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just interrupt while this is fresh. This service access road that is going to be used for emergency uses, can it serve as a dual role at the same time? If you've got an emergency and you have somebody in there fixing something, which you don't suppose is going to happen, but those occurrences do happen, will that be able to serve as a dual role at the same time?

MR. BRANGMAN: The service roadway itself is a separate lane that actually happens out adjacent to the bike trail. The turnaround area for emergency vehicles at the west end of the facility is large enough to hold two or three vehicles if they were to

2.0

2	vehicles in that area.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And also be
4	accommodating the emergency use that hopefully doesn't
5	happen?
6	MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: At the same time?
8	MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
10	Madam Chair, let me just say I am still
11	not satisfied with that answer, but I am just so
12	they can move on with their questioning.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Dr. Schuette, go
14	ahead.
15	DR. SCHUETTE: This is actually for the
16	National Park Service. You mentioned an exchange
17	agreement. Could you describe the limits that are in
18	that exchange agreement beyond the no parking?
19	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I would be glad to.
20	DR. SCHUETTE: Would it be possible to get
21	a copy of that?
22	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes. It's I believe been
23	submitted as part of the zoning application. And it's
24	recorded in the land records. And we'll be happy to
25	make a copy available to the parties.

park there. It is large enough to hold two or three

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me just interrupt you real quick. Anything that is provided to the 2 3 record by the applicant and other parties after this date you will be served with. 4 5 DR. SCHUETTE: Right. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But anything that was 6 7 submitted prior you will have to get yourself or if 8 Ms. Blumenthal is offering to give you a copy, then 9 she will give you one. 10 MS. BLUMENTHAL: But not tonight. 11 DR. SCHUETTE: But not that copy. 12 MS. BLUMENTHAL: Right. 13 DR. SCHUETTE: I don't want your copy. Ι 14 would like a copy. 15 MS. BLUMENTHAL: These are following 16 either prohibitive or prescriptive conditions of this 17 exchange agreement: that the design is generally 18 consistent with the design, excluding size, it being 19 understood that the university's contemplated 2.0 improvements are larger of either boathouse row on the 21 Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania or the 22 boathouses of Northeastern University; b) does not 23 have a footprint or aggregate footprint of more than

15,000 square feet for a boathouse structure, not

exceeding 40 feet in height, excluding space at grade

24

and below the building and any additional height is as necessary to accommodate design features. The location of the boathouse structure shall not be at a greater distance than 1,155 feet west of Key Bridge.

The United States recognizes the physical limitations and sit conditions may not permit such a siting and agrees that, if necessary, to resolve extreme physical design constraints caused by the limitations or conditions of the site which prevent the university from designing a boathouse structure containing the facilities listed, dah dah dah, the boathouse may be situated more than 1,155 feet west of Key Bridge so long as no portion of the boathouse is located beyond a point 1,250 feet west of the Key Bridge.

And, in fact, I believe we had to take advantage of this provision because of the requirements of WASA relative to the sewer. We had to do some shifting because where the sewer passes under the site and what their requirements were that we did not know when we signed this in 1994.

The university proposes --

MS. GIORDANO: Madam Chair, I am just wondering if Ms. Blumenthal is going to provide this, if it makes more sense --

2.0

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you think you are
2	going to have some cross-examination questions on the
3	substance or
4	DR. SCHUETTE: I absolutely will, but if I
5	can do that later.
6	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The rest are just an
7	enumeration, rather than contractual. It is
8	understood the university boathouse may contain the
9	following facilities.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Before you keep
11	reading, in light of the fact that if we provide the
12	document to Dr. Schuette and he has some additional
13	questions, would you agree to follow up when we
14	reconvene?
15	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's do it
17	that way.
18	DR. SCHUETTE: I appreciate that. It is
19	unfair. We have been asking for that. I thank you
20	for your time.
21	I think there is only one last question.
22	And that would be, the other universities, you
23	obviously went and saw them all. Do they have a
24	historic national park as their backdrop and a rails
25	to trail, like the Capital Crescent Trail, immediately

Are there any other facilities that

embody that type of river gorge? 2 actually familiar with --3 you mentioned Princeton boathouse. It's been there since 4 5 1900. But it's all by itself. Has anybody else got a historic national park behind them? 6 7 MS. BLUMENTHAL: I would like to address 8 Princeton, which I believe is on the Raritan, Lake on 9 the Raritan, and Brunswick, Raritan and Trenton Canal. 10 It's a state park. It's actually very similar to the 11 C&O Canal, same vintage, same transportation. I'm not 12 sure about Boston, but Princeton I know is on a park 13 circumstance. 14 MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe there's any 15 other on national paris. The boathouses in 16 Philadelphia that almost everyone is familiar with on 17 boathouse row are in Fairmount Park, a city park. 18 They probably for the most part are older than the 19 park is, but they are now regulated by Fairmount Park. 20 In Boston it's -- I'm not sure what the 21 organization is called but a state agency that 22 monitors the waterway and the river. And some of 23 those facilities are very old and some that have been built in the last few years have had, although not any 24 25 federal regulations, they deal with a lot of state and

1

behind them?

Τ	city, particularly at Boston University and
2	Northeastern.
3	DR. SCHUETTE: You've mentioned these
4	other facilities; in particular, boathouse row, which
5	I think is what the waterfront is trying to achieve,
6	that look and feel of uniform boathouses up and down
7	the river. How large are those in comparison to the
8	proposed facility?
9	MR. JOHNSON: Most of the boathouses on
LO	boathouse row are not as large. The boathouse that is
L1	actually two clubs that are joined is probably larger,
L2	and that's Vesper Boat Club and Malta. The rest of
L3	those facilities are smaller, and they are constrained
L4	on any additions because the other buildings are so
L5	close to them.
L6	I think Malta/Vesper is one building but
L7	two clubs, is considerably larger. It has a third
L8	floor in it, a full third floor. But other than that,
L9	the rest are smaller.
20	DR. SCHUETTE: So it's taller in height as
21	well as in span, in depth?
22	MR. JOHNSON: I'm not entirely sure how
23	many bays there are in that combined facility. I
24	think it's at least five. It might be more than five
25	bays.

	DR. SCHOETTE: THE Other boathouses on
2	boathouse row, are they a tenth the size of this
3	structure, a fifth, half?
4	MR. JOHNSON: I haven't measured.
5	DR. SCHUETTE: Mr. Muse, you probably have
6	a feel for sizes of boathouses.
7	MR. MUSE: We didn't measure those
8	boathouses. On our tour, we looked for what we
9	thought were the positive features of every area that
10	we could take from it.
11	We do think that the best thing about
12	boathouse row in Philadelphia is the collective
13	quality of that many buildings together, which is what
14	we are trying to achieve here in Georgetown.
15	There really is not a boathouse there per
16	se that functions well as a boathouse today. They all
17	are functionally challenged. So they are not the ones
18	that we looked at in terms of coming into the program
19	that we are looking for.
20	DR. SCHUETTE: My understanding was
21	boathouse row was
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is this going to be a
23	question?
24	DR. SCHUETTE: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. You have a way

_	of feating files them that doesn't sound fike a
2	question.
3	DR. SCHUETTE: I'm new to this.
4	(Pause.)
5	DR. SCHUETTE: See, now look what you have
6	done to me.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You said "My
8	understanding of."
9	DR. SCHUETTE: My understanding of
10	boathouse row is that it is approximately 1,200 feet
11	long with 9 to 10 boathouses there. Would you care
12	to, then, take a guess as to the size of those
13	boathouses relative to this structure, frontal span?
14	MS. GIORDANO: I think the witness has
15	already indicated they haven't measured, and they just
16	don't know.
17	DR. SCHUETTE: Then another logical
18	question, you talked about this boathouse on the
19	Potomac River and what it looks like. You showed a
20	picture, and you have obviously done the analysis.
21	What size is this boathouse compared to the other
22	boathouses in the D.C. area?
23	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I think we have measured
24	it as against Thompson's. It's about 50 feet longer

1	and Thompson's is about 220, something like that. We
2	can provide that exact answer. It is bigger but not
3	by much.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is Thompson's the
5	next biggest or is Thompson's currently the largest
6	boathouse in D.C.?
7	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes. There are only two
8	rowing boathouses in D.C. right now anyway: Potomac
9	Boat Club and Thompson's.
10	DR. SCHUETTE: What about on the
11	Anacostia?
12	MS. BLUMENTHAL: There is one garage that
13	has been converted into a boathouse. It's not billed
14	as a boathouse. It's a garage. There are only two
15	boathouses billed as boathouses in the District of
16	Columbia.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If we could get the
18	dimensions of Thompson's, I think that would be
19	helpful.
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Certainly.
21	MR. MUSE: Just to add one thing to that,
22	there are really two issues when you talk about size.
23	One is the length, and one is the scale of it. So I
24	think not just hearing the length but seeing the scale
25	of the building, how it's not broken into parts, now

1	it's not broken into three parts to break the scale
2	down, makes a big difference.
3	DR. SCHUETTE: As a editorial comment, it
4	also matters where it's located. Thompson's is down
5	at Washington Harbor.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
7	DR. SCHUETTE: I would recommend and I
8	would provide the URL and submit if you'd like. The
9	National Park Service did an excellent study on
10	boathouses. And, in fact, the one that is described
11	at
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You'll need to submit
13	that for the record if you want us to look at it.
14	MS. GIORDANO: I think this is testimony.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
16	DR. SCHUETTE: Close.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any other questions
18	there?
19	DR. SCHUETTE: I think I am questioned
20	out, and I appreciate your indulgence.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
22	Mr. Mopsik for the Chesapeake and Ohio
23	Canal Association.
24	MR. MOPSIK: Hopefully I won't have too
25	many questions. One of the things that puzzled me

1	tonight is do you consider the C&O Canal Park as a
2	neighbor?
3	MR. BRANGMAN: I would say we do consider
4	the park as a neighbor, which is one of the reasons
5	why we spent time with the C&O Canal Commission.
6	MR. MOPSIK: When did you last contact the
7	commission?
8	MR. BRANGMAN: I believe we had some
9	contact after our actual meeting presentation with
10	them in order to follow up on some questions about the
11	separation of the bike trail and our service lane. I
12	would have to look back at our files to give you an
13	actual date as to when that was.
14	MR. MOPSIK: Well, the question I am
15	really getting after is you said they had given
16	approval, and I was wondering when that was. Do you
17	have it on the record?
18	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I can respond to one of
19	them, but we will have to provide the date. In the
20	1995 time frame, we got an affirmative approval of the
21	land exchange. And there have been subsequent
22	meetings with them on the design of the boathouse.
23	But we would have to go and look and see what the
24	dates were.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just for our

1	clarification, has the what's it called again? I'm
2	sorry?
3	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The C&O Canal National
4	Historical Park Advisory Commission.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Has that commission
6	approved the plan, the project, this project?
7	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.
8	MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, Madam Chair.
9	Actually, there is a letter in the record of their
10	comments relative to the plan as it was presented to
11	them.
12	MR. MOPSIK: My question is, what was the
13	date of that.
14	MR. BRANGMAN: It was in the Fall of 2001,
15	but I don't have the exact date.
16	MR. MOPSIK: What drawings were shown to
17	them?
18	MR. BRANGMAN: The same drawings that we
19	are presenting this evening.
20	MR. MOPSIK: Well, I had a question on
21	some of those drawings, like the one that is sitting
22	over on the left. I assume the background is meant to
23	be more or less correct.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So you're referring
25	to the aerial photograph?
	II

1	MR. MOPSIK: No, no, no, no. It's on
2	the floor in front of
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can somebody please
4	hold it up so that we can identify it for the record?
5	MR. BRANGMAN: These are the illustrative
6	illustrations.
7	MR. MOPSIK: Were those the ones that were
8	used?
9	MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.
10	MR. MOPSIK: Is that background meant to
11	be correct?
12	MR. BRANGMAN: It's an illustrative
13	illustration.
14	MR. JOHNSON: If I could add one thing to
15	that? At the time of some of these drawings, the
16	actual accurate survey was not complete. And so I
17	believe the one on the floor, Bill, that the bank that
18	goes up to the towpath I don't believe is at scale,
19	correct scale.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So the east
21	elevation?
22	MR. JOHNSON: The bank, that slope. Well,
23	I think the slope, the angle, wasn't that higher, we
24	found, steeper? The survey had not been completed at
25	the time that we did this. And so some of the

1	accuracy of that background and, therefore, the
2	background around the view that we were looking at
3	before might not be correct.
4	MR. MOPSIK: What was the date of that
5	drawing? Two thousand one? Thank you.
6	What considerations were made in the
7	design vis-a-vis the view from the C&O Canal towpath?
8	MR. MUSE: We actually have photographs.
9	Do you want to show those? We did look at it from
10	that level, both in terms of the dense vegetation that
11	you see but also in once again not making one building
12	but breaking it into parts and having gaps between the
13	parts to lower the scale to improve the view.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The photographs
15	you're showing us are a series of photographs taken
16	across the canal looking at the towpath and beyond.
17	Is that correct?
18	MR. MUSE: That is true.
19	MR. JOHNSON: There are views that are on
20	the towpath itself and one from the eastern,
21	approximately the eastern, end of the building looking
22	west and the other one from the western end of the
23	property looking back.
24	I took these when the question of vantage
25	and view from the canal, the towpath was raised.

	Obviously this is a summer view, and it is different
2	in the winter. But there isn't a lot of view of the
3	river.
4	You're aware of glimpses of the river
5	through the trees. You're aware in many places that
6	the river is there, but you don't have a clear view.
7	I then went across. And you can see here
8	the wall. I am on what little sidewalk there is
9	beside Canal Road, besides the canal, and looking back
10	at some of those same vantage points and straight
11	ahead to try and show that there isn't much view
12	through the trees in the summertime.
13	MR. MOPSIK: And what height does the
14	building come to in those photographs?
15	MR. KIRWAN: The main roof in the center
16	is 21 feet above the towpath. The low roofs of the
17	two side wings are seven and a half feet above the
18	towpath.
19	MR. MOPSIK: But you don't have any
20	drawings of how these buildings would look from the
21	canal, do you, no elevations?
22	MR. KIRWAN: No.
23	MR. MOPSIK: Have they ever been presented
24	to anybody? Were they ever done?
25	MR. KIRWAN: We have elevations from the

1	bicycle path but not from the canal. That has not
2	been requested.
3	MR. MOPSIK: When you said there were no
4	environmental impacts anywhere, did you consider any
5	possible scenic or visual ones from the C&O Canal?
6	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I would say the Park
7	Service absolutely considered that. The C&O Canal is
8	185 miles long. This is a very tiny stretch of it.
9	And the property that Georgetown owns,
10	which is further up the canal, if that were built on
11	would have a far greater impact on the C&O Canal than
12	at the urban edge of Georgetown.
13	We are just at the urban edge of
14	Georgetown. The whole character of the canal changes
15	here.
16	MR. MOPSIK: Were there any considerations
17	of dropping the roof line to improve the sight lines
18	from the canal?
19	MR. MUSE: No.
20	MR. MOPSIK: Thank you. I think I will
21	end it at that point.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
23	Mr. Brooks?
24	Oh, Mr. Mopsik, I am going to need you to
25	fill out the two witness cards and give them to the

1	reporter.
2	MR. MOPSIK: Oh, I'm sorry.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. You need to
4	give them to him. Thanks.
5	MR. BROOKS: Do I need to identify myself?
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would help.
7	MR. BROOKS: My name is Ernie Brooks. I
8	am the current chair of the Coalition for the Capital
9	Crescent Trail. I have several questions, but since I
10	hadn't expected to be allowed party status, my
11	testimony will only be about five minutes. So maybe
12	that will sort of offset.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, as long as
14	they're relevant questions, just ask as many as you
15	need to.
16	MR. BROOKS: I did have a question for Ms.
17	Blumenthal with regard to the Park Service acquisition
18	of the Capital Crescent Trail. Do you know when the
19	Park Service acquired the trail?
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Nineteen eighty-eight.
21	MR. BROOKS: Did they acquire that from
22	CSX or from Kingdon Gould?
23	MS. BLUMENTHAL: It's a complicated story.
24	CSX Railroad
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Before you tell us

the complicated story, I am going to ask Mr. Brooks 1 what's the relevance. 2 3 MR. BROOKS: It may not matter. I will 4 get that straightened out later. But I wasn't quite 5 sure of the date. That's what I wanted to find out. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 6 7 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We would love to hear 9 it but not this late. 10 MR. BROOKS: The next question is for How 11 Georgetown. would the students access the 12 proposed boathouse? Do they use those steps that come 13 down sort of near the aqueduct? 14 MR. JOHNSON: There are several routes that one could use. I think it will depend on where 15 16 they live, on or off campus. In and around Key 17 Bridge, first you have to get across the canal. 18 Presumably they would cross either coming down in the 19 that we refer to as the exorcist steps steps, 2.0 alongside the car barn, across the Whitehurst Freeway 21 and down the concrete steps, and then either down the 22 steps, the concrete steps, that are to the east of the 23 Aqueduct Bridge or the wooden steps that are to the west or they can come down 34th Street, straight 24

across the footbridge across the bridge there or if

they live in this new campus facility, 780-bed,	that
2 will open this fall or they live up in Berlea	th, I
wouldn't be surprised if they come through the	tunnel
and down the Capital Crescent Trail, the tunnel	. that
is behind the three sisters.	
6 MR. BROOKS: Okay. This would also	be I
7 think someone from Georgetown testified and I	I just
8 wanted to make sure I had this correct. You ind	icated
9 that the upstream parcel was a gift from CSX ob-	tained
in 1991? Is that correct?	
MR. JOHNSON: I thought it was 1989.	I'm
not sure exactly.	
MS. BLUMENTHAL: I think our dates	are a
little cockeyed.	
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Did you ne	ed a
precise date or approximate?	
MR. BROOKS: I suppose the main thing	g I am
interested in is the relative dates of when the	e Park
Service acquired the right-of-way and when Georg	getown
acquired its parcel and its access over	the
right-of-way.	
MS. BLUMENTHAL: I guess the best v	ay to
answer that is at the time the Park Service acc	quired
the right-of-way from CSX, Georgetown already	owned
its parcel and its access.	

	MR. BROOKS: Okay. But Since you said
2	they acquired it in '88
3	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, then I think we are
4	mixed up on our dates.
5	MR. BROOKS: We need to get that straight.
6	MS. BLUMENTHAL: We will clarify the
7	dates.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We'll clarify
9	that.
10	MR. BROOKS: Let's see. I believe in
11	response to one of the questions from the panel or
12	from the commission it was stated that the university
13	would have a difficult time getting by with a smaller
14	boathouse and with less in the way of facilities than
15	what is included in the current design.
16	I also understood in that current design
17	that the rowing tank would be 46 feet by 93 feet.
18	That's a modular piece. Is that correct?
19	MR. MUSE: It's based on the size of the
20	rowing stations, yes.
21	MR. BROOKS: Right. Okay. And that the
22	exercise room is 40 feet by 72 feet?
23	MR. MUSE: Yes, that's correct.
24	MR. BROOKS: And, Ms. Blumenthal, I assume
25	you would know this. The upstream parcel is 45 feet

2	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Approximately.
3	MR. BROOKS: So, then, neither of those
4	items would have fit in a boathouse built upstream.
5	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, every project is
6	designed for the property that it sits on. This
7	particular design would not fit on that property, but
8	a boathouse of a different size and different
9	dimension certainly could fit on the property. it
LO	would have to be a longitudinal design, rather than a
L1	wide design. And it would have to be loaded. But
L2	it's certainly an acre of property that is capable of
L3	supporting a boathouse or boathouses.
L4	MR. BROOKS: But it was stated that all
L5	the facilities needed to be there. And a 46 by
L6	93-foot rowing tank doesn't fit on a 45
L7	MR. JOHNSON: I think the dimensions
L8	and we have talked about looking this up. I think
L9	it's 52 feet wide by some 1,000-some feet long.
20	Because it's commercial, we were told we could build
21	right to the property line.
22	We weren't talking about what the rowing
23	tank is. A rowing tank could be configured
24	differently. In this case, a 24-person tank could be
25	longer and not as wide if we wanted to have it

by 1,067 feet?

1	configured differently. It would fit. We could make
2	a tank fit in the property we had up there.
3	MR. BROOKS: Okay. I do have the survey,
4	the CSX survey, and it's 45 feet by 1,066 feet. That
5	is the actual dimension.
6	It was stated that the wings on the
7	proposed boathouse are the same height as the
8	Washington Canoe Club. I just wanted to clarify. Are
9	they the same height as the roof line of the canoe
LO	club or the cupola on the canoe club?
L1	MR. MUSE: Actually, we didn't say that
L2	the wings were the same height.
L3	MR. BROOKS: Oh, I'm sorry.
L4	MR. MUSE: We said that the wings were the
L5	first step down, and they step down to 41 feet. The
L6	height of the entry, which steps down to 32 feet, that
L7	matches the height of the Washington Canoe Club.
L8	MR. BROOKS: But is it the height of the
L9	roof line or the cupola?
20	MR. MUSE: The ridge.
21	MR. BROOKS: The ridge is the
22	MR. MUSE: The top of the roof.
23	MR. BROOKS: top of the roof line?
24	Okay. Thank you.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you repeat
J	

1	that? I didn't quite get the last statement.
2	Thirty-two feet is what relative to
3	MR. MUSE: It might be helpful if Bill
4	points as I do this. There are two steps on that
5	side. The other elevation is probably helpful.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And the height of
7	MR. MUSE: We start at 54 feet at the
8	height of the ridge. And, once again, when it was
9	mentioned before that the height of that building was
10	54 feet, that's the ridge, just the ridge line. It
11	slopes down from there.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
13	MR. MUSE: We go to 41 feet. And that's
14	the height, the ridge height, of those wings. And
15	then we step down again at the entry, the third step.
16	And that's 32 feet. And that's the height of the
17	Washington Canoe Club.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: In response to Mr.
19	Brooks' question, that's the roof line of the canoe
20	club?
21	MR. MUSE: Yes. That's the top of the
22	roof.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
24	That's the part I missed. Thanks.
25	MR. BROOKS: Let's see. I'm sorry. I

1	don't remember his last name but Bill with the
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Kirwan.
3	MR. BROOKS: Thank you.
4	You mentioned when talking about the
5	access trail going into the new boathouse and being
6	parallel with the Capital Crescent Trail that it was
7	designed in consultation with the National Park
8	Service. I believe you said the Capital Crescent
9	Trail Commission. I'm not sure.
10	MR. KIRWAN: The Canal Commission, the C&O
11	Canal Commission.
12	MR. BROOKS: Oh, I just wanted to make
13	sure that you didn't mean it was with the Capital
14	Crescent Trail Coalition.
15	MR. KIRWAN: No. Canal Commission.
16	MR. BROOKS: Right. Thank you. The EA
17	that was done in 1995, did it anticipate the
18	possibility of retaining walls being needed on the
19	embankment of the C&O Canal for the shifted-over
20	Capital Crescent Trail?
21	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The 1995 environmental
22	assessment was not done on the design of a building.
23	It was done on the basis of the natural and cultural
24	values of two parcels with no improvements on them
25	because at that point in time, there were no

2	a land exchange.
3	MR. BROOKS: So that hasn't been studied
4	under environmental considerations, what impact that
5	could have on the canal?
6	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Wait. What is the
7	question again? The retaining wall?
8	MR. BROOKS: Yes. When the trail is
9	shifted as far to the north as it can possibly be
10	shifted to accommodate the new entranceway, the only
11	way you can get it shifted far enough over to get the
12	width that your landscape architect showed on his
13	plans would be in some sections, you will have to cut
14	into that, the embankment for the slope of the Capital
15	Crescent Trail.
16	MR. BRANGMAN: That is not true. There is
17	no proposal in our design right now to include any
18	retaining walls because any cut that is done into the
19	hill is not sufficient enough to require retaining
20	walls.
21	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Additionally, the
22	right-of-way is 30 feet wide. They're talking about a
23	ten-foot-wide bike trail and a ten-foot-wide access
24	road. That leaves ten feet on either side.
25	MR. BROOKS: The landscape architect

improvements. In other words, it was on the basis of

1	drawing that Mr. Johnson showed me, you're only
2	allowing 25 feet for the combined Capital Crescent
3	Trail and the entranceway because there are a couple
4	of points where that is all the width you have.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can I just interrupt
6	a second and just follow up on one comment that Ms.
7	Blumenthal made, which is you said that the
8	environmental assessment that was performed in 1995
9	didn't reflect the design of any particular building.
10	It was absent buildings. Is that correct?
11	MS. BLUMENTHAL: That's correct. It was
12	on the concept of a land exchange of two parcels of
13	land on the basis of their relative cultural and
14	natural value, their value as wetlands, their
15	relationship to the palisades and the park and the C&O
16	Canal.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Was that the
18	environmental assessment that gave rise to the finding
19	of no significant impact?
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: As far as a land exchange
21	itself was concerned, yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So as it stands right
23	now relative to this project, there has not been a
24	finding of no significant impact relative to this
25	project. Is that correct?

1 MS. BLUMENTHAL: To the design boathouse, to the boathouse itself? 2 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. 4 MS. BLUMENTHAL: No. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Sorry for the interruption. 6 Brooks. 7 Oh, that's all right. MR. BROOKS: 8 talking about the new entrance road, I just wanted to 9 make sure I understood this. I believe someone said 10 that people -- and I guess that would be crews from 11 other universities, people coming to the boathouse to 12 witness a race or to just participate in whatever 13 happens at a race would be shuttled to the boathouse 14 along this new entrance road. 15 MR. BRANGMAN: No, no. We did talk about 16 shuttling teams and shuttling spectators from the 17 campus down to the boathouse. They would not be --18 buses would not run all the way to the boathouse. 19 Buses would run to the end of Water Street and would 2.0 turn around at that point and then head back to the 21 campus. MR. JOHNSON: I think, just for further 22 23 clarification there, the university has stated that 24 they're in support of an agreement that if there is a 25 need, people could park on campus and be shuttled down

1	to the site, whether that be a spectator or whatever.
2	Most events should not require that
3	because people who are watching the event we would
4	presume would go down to the finish line, would not
5	need that access to the boathouse. But the parking is
6	available on campus.
7	It's a ten-minute walk headed through the
8	tunnel stairs to this site. If someone wanted to
9	walk, they could. If someone wanted to ride in a
10	shuttle, the university would provide it.
11	I don't think there will be very many
12	times, if any, that we would need to provide shuttle
13	service for people for an event at the boathouse.
14	MR. BROOKS: But, in any event, they would
15	not be shuttled past Water Street?
16	MR. JOHNSON: A bus would not need to come
17	up there at any point. That's correct.
18	MR. BROOKS: I mean, I
19	MR. JOHNSON: For a shell trailer to come
20	up to unload will fit, will work, will take up the
21	space we have. No. A bus, there's no need. People
22	can walk that distance. You know, if it was a car
23	with people and there was some reason to drive all the
24	way up, they could do that.
25	MR. BROOKS: So it doesn't sound like it

1	would be possible to have some sort of a statement put
2	into the record that no vehicles taking people to the
3	boat site would be allowed on the entrance road. We
4	would like to see that.
5	MR. JOHNSON: The whole purpose of
6	separating the bike trail from our service road is so
7	that we do not have to interfere with the bike trail,
8	whether that is a delivery, a cleanup, or some other
9	vehicle coming in and out.
10	Beyond that, I am not sure. I don't know
11	what else we need to state.
12	MR. BROOKS: Actually, you answered that
13	one. I could be down to my last question here. Mr.
14	Gross mentioned that the grassy area that's on the
15	eastern edge of this parcel would remain intact and
16	the views of Key Bridge and the river that you get
17	from the Capital Crescent Trail would be maintained.
18	I have to say from my understanding of the
19	siting of the building, that's not how I understood
20	it. And so I wondered if any of the representatives
21	from GU could possibly meet one of the representatives
22	from the coalition out at the site and help us see
23	where the building is going before the
24	MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely, absolutely.
25	MR. BROOKS: Would that be all right?

_	MR. JOHNSON: ADSOLUTELY. Well, I II talk
2	to you about that.
3	MR. BROOKS: I think that is it for me.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
5	Brooks.
6	MR. BROOKS: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that I was a
8	little overly optimistic when I thought we would get
9	through the Office of Planning report tonight with
LO	cross-examination.
11	So I think what we will do is we will run
L2	down the list of additional submissions that we need
13	to see. The first order will be all of the various
L4	exhibits that have been on the easels tonight because
15	we have very few, if any, of those in the record so
L6	far.
L7	Mr. Hood, you had asked about some views.
L8	We are going to get those, the straight-on view from
L9	the river. Were there any other views that you
20	wanted?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The only other
22	view, Madam Chair, I would like to see a view from
23	behind it. I don't know whether that's coming from
24	Crescent Trail or from Canal Road. I would just like
25	to see from behind the boathouse.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry? From behind?
From Capital Crescent Trail?
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: From either the
Crescent Trail or Canal Road. I'm not sure which one
I
MR. JOHNSON: Well, the photographs that
are there
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do you have it?
MR. JOHNSON: are from the towpath on
the canal and from Canal Road. I have additional
photographs.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you give us a
rendering that would show
MR. JOHNSON: What you would see through
the trees?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I think Mr.
Hood wants to know what it would look like if you were
on the Capital Crescent Trail.
MR. JOHNSON: Not a photograph but a
drawing of the building?
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, right.
MR. JOHNSON: Okay.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The boathouse, how
I would see it if I'm on the trail.
MR. JOHNSON: Right. I think

	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: DO YOU HAVE
2	something that would satisfy it?
3	MR. JOHNSON: The point of those pictures
4	was to show you that if you were looking from the
5	canal without trying to peer through, you aren't going
6	to see anything except leaves.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But I think that's
8	the towpath. This is the trail that will be
9	MR. JOHNSON: No. The purpose of the
10	pictures
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand the
12	purpose of the pictures. I think I am just trying to
13	connect with what Mr. Hood wants, which is the trail.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, while
15	he's doing that, we are going to have smaller sized
16	pictures of
17	MR. JOHNSON: Actually, we have a drawing
18	from the trail.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You have a drawing
20	from the trail? Oh, okay. They've been holding out
21	on us.
22	MR. JOHNSON: No. Actually, I think it's
23	been up there the whole time.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's what you would
25	see?
I	

1	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's what I
4	would see from the trail?
5	MR. JOHNSON: That's the elevation on the
6	trail.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So there's nothing.
8	There's no landscaping. It's just right there. I
9	guess that's what
10	MR. MUSE: Yes, that's the elevation, the
11	architectural elevation. If you would like us to
12	render that with the landscape from the west side,
13	yes, we can do that.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that would be
15	helpful just so that we know
16	MR. MUSE: That's fine.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. A user is
18	going to see the full elevation.
19	MR. MUSE: We can draw a perspective
20	drawing coming down the trail and show what it looks
21	like from this side.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, are
24	we going to get our own copies, like this?
	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Of all of this?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, they will submit
3	those for the record.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I like to sit and
5	look at it when I am reading.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I agree. But you're
7	going to have to submit those photographs for the
8	record. Okay. And then we were going to get some
9	dimensions of Thompson's boathouse. And one of the
10	earlier questions was regarding the setback. So if
11	you could include the setback from the water on that
12	one?
13	Mr. Muse had mentioned that there is a
14	proposal or you are considering landscaping the area
15	between the boathouse and the Washington Canoe Club,
16	but we don't have a landscape plan that shows that.
17	So if that is part of your proposal at least not
18	that I am aware of. So if that is part of the
19	proposal, we should have a landscape plan that shows
20	that.
21	And then Mr. May had asked for a drawing
22	that would illustrate how the zoning height
23	measurement was made.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that can just
25	be done with existing drawings, just putting in those

1	dimensions, the dimension strings, and the sections or
2	something.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
4	MR. BRANGMAN: Madam Chair?
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, sir?
6	MR. BRANGMAN: Just as a point of
7	clarification, there is a landscape plan in the set
8	that was submitted. But I am wondering if
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Tell me which drawing
10	numbers.
11	MR. BRANGMAN: It's L-1.1. But I'm
12	wondering
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: When were those
14	submitted? I don't have that in my package.
15	MR. BRANGMAN: You don't?
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No.
16 17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No.  MR. BRANGMAN: All right.
	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.
17	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.
17 18	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,
17 18 19 20	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,  not in this set. I don't have an L drawing in there.
17 18 19	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,  not in this set. I don't have an L drawing in there.  MR. BRANGMAN: There should be.
17 18 19 20 21	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,  not in this set. I don't have an L drawing in there.  MR. BRANGMAN: There should be.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You know what? I
17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,  not in this set. I don't have an L drawing in there.  MR. BRANGMAN: There should be.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You know what? I misspoke. I found it.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BRANGMAN: All right.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not in this set,  not in this set. I don't have an L drawing in there.  MR. BRANGMAN: There should be.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You know what? I  misspoke. I found it.  MR. BRANGMAN: Okay. Also, I'm sensing

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great.
MR. BRANGMAN: We can get copies of these
made
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great.
MR. BRANGMAN: so that they could be
included with many steps.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
MS. BLUMENTHAL: Was I to understand that
there was a request for a list of boathouses in
national parks from Mr. Schuette?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't recall that.
MS. BLUMENTHAL: A list of boathouses in
national parks?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you would like to
share that with Mr. Schuette, that's fine. I don't
know that the Commission is
MS. BLUMENTHAL: Including the Washington
Canoe Club, which is in a national park.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anything else
that the Commission would like to see, Mr. May, Mr.
Hood, Mr. Hannaham? Anything else that I forgot, Mr.
Bastida?
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I am
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I am going back to this L-1.1. So are you saying that that

	saying?
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, no, no, no.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Because I
4	was going to say it doesn't to me.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No. That was on to
6	another.
7	MS. SANCHEZ: I just had a couple of other
8	things, Chairman Mitten. I don't know if you guys
9	still want these, but for the applicant to address the
10	issue of the public using the facility as far as the
11	parking issue, they were going to address that.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. Well, if they
13	want to respond to it, they'll submit something.
14	MS. SANCHEZ: Okay. And a reconfiguration
15	of K Street, what's it going to look like. I believe
16	the National Park
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
18	MS. SANCHEZ: Service was going to
19	provide something, even if it was in the early stages.
20	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I would ask you if you
21	could ask that question in a different way. We are in
22	very early conversations
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What can you respond
24	to?
25	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, let me tell you

1	what I can respond to you. Then maybe you could ask
2	it in a different way. There is a schematic, a hatch
3	line sort of drawing that was done in 1987. Our park
4	plan shows a turnaround, which we will be submitting
5	for the record tonight, shows a turnaround directly
6	under Key Bridge. Our designers are convinced that
7	you within the arch of Key Bridge could turn a fire
8	truck around.
9	DDOT has gone through the process but not
10	given a notice to proceed to a contractor that will
11	actually be doing the design of that roadway. So we
12	are not going to be able to be particularly specific
13	or give you drawings and renderings.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So this is a park
15	plan that shows
16	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then if you
18	would do that, that would be great.
19	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I can do that.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that all that you
21	have?
22	MS. SANCHEZ: A couple of more things just
23	to make sure. Configuration of the fence access at
24	the Aqueduct Bridge, I believe it was.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. I don't think

1	we need that.
2	MS. SANCHEZ: The size of the new
3	facility, what is it in comparison to Thompson's.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're trying to get
5	the dimensions on Thompson's.
6	MS. SANCHEZ: And show Thompson's boat
7	facility versus their need for the 80-foot center, the
8	new building.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sorry. Say the
10	last thing again.
11	MS. SANCHEZ: To show the Thompson's boat
12	facility. Someone requested or brought up, I believe,
13	may have been Mr. Schuette, the center of the new
14	building was 80 feet, I believe, one of the dimensions
15	was 80 feet. And he wanted to know why that was
16	needed in comparison to what Thompson's has right now.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If the applicant
18	wants to submit something to us, that's their option.
19	MS. SANCHEZ: One other thing was just to
20	clarify the dates of acquisition on the property
21	Georgetown owns or is exchanging.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would just say that
23	if you would cooperate with Mr. Brooks in trying to
24	get those dates.
	1

And I would like to ask -- yes, sir?

1	SECRETARY BASTIDA: I think that there is
2	another small point. There is another minor point,
3	the Thompson's boathouse capacity versus the
4	Georgetown University capacity, the proposed.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I had asked about the
6	number of different kinds of shells that could be
7	stored. And Mr. Johnson responded to that.
8	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Okay. Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
10	I would like to ask the Office of
11	Planning. There are references made in your report,
12	just so we'll have the record complete when we come
13	back together, that the Housing and Community
14	Development had indicated their support. We don't
15	have a report from them. Parks and Rec supports the
16	application. We don't have a report from them. MPD
17	and WASA also indicated either their support or no
18	opposition. And we don't have reports from them.
19	I would ask you to use whatever influence
20	you have on DDOT to get them to weigh in on the
21	parking plan, if you would, please. Thank you.
22	Anything else? Anybody not clear about
23	what we're doing?
24	(No response.)
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We will have some

1	additional submissions. We will reconvene on
2	Thursday, June 5th, 6:30, and will hold a good thought
3	that we will finish that night.
4	(Whereupon, at 10:53 p.m., the foregoing
5	matter was recessed, to reconvene at 6:30
6	p.m. on Thursday, June 5, 2003.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	